



DISSERTATION

ON

SCIENTIFIC NOMENCLATURE,

Medical and General;

EXHIBITING

THE DEFECTS, ANOMALIES, ERRORS, AND DISCREPANCIES

OF ITS PRESENT CONDITION:

WITH SUGGESTIONS FOR ITS IMPROVEMENT.

By R. G. MAYNE, M.D.,

SURGEON TO THE LEEDS LOCK HOSPITAL.

LONDON:

JOHN CHURCHILL, PRINCES-STREET, SOHO.

M DCCC XLIX.



DISSERTATION
ON
SCIENTIFIC NOMENCLATURE,
ETC., ETC.



DISSERTATION
ON
SCIENTIFIC NOMENCLATURE,
MEDICAL AND GENERAL;
EXHIBITING
THE DEFECTS, ANOMALIES, ERRORS, AND DISCREPANCIES
OF ITS PRESENT CONDITION:
WITH SUGGESTIONS FOR ITS IMPROVEMENT.

By R. G. MAYNE, M. D.,
SURGEON TO THE LEEDS LOCK HOSPITAL.

"A REFORM IN NOMENCLATURE IS AT ONCE THE USUAL RESULT OF PROGRESS IN MEDICAL SCIENCE, AND THE EFFICIENT CAUSE OF IMPROVEMENTS IN THE ART AND PRACTICE OF MEDICINE."—*Dr. M. Hall.*

LONDON:
JOHN CHURCHILL, PRINCES-STREET, SOHO.
M DCCC XLIX.

ANTHONY PICKARD, PRINTER, LEEDS.

R35989

TO WILLIAM ALEXANDER GREENHILL, M. D., OXON.

MY DEAR SIR,

Allow me thus to inscribe the following Suggestions, in token of Respect for your Character as a Christian and a Scholar, and in grateful Acknowledgment of your Candour and Courtesy towards,

My Dear Sir,

Yours sincerely,

R. G. MAYNE.

LEEDS, December 13th, 1848.



CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION,

PAGE 9.

DIVISION I.

COMPRISING TERMS COMMON TO THE NOMENCLATURE OF
MEDICAL AND GENERAL SCIENCE.

	<i>Page.</i>
SECTION I.—Of Latin terms derived from the Greek, ending in <i>-ides</i> , and in <i>-ide</i> , ...	17
SECTION II.—Of Latin terms formed from Greek derivatives, ending in <i>-ideus</i> , ...	26
SECTION III.—Of Latin terms derived from the Greek, ending in <i>-adæ</i> , <i>-idæ</i> , and <i>-ida</i> , ...	32
SECTION IV.—Of Latin terms derived from the Greek, ending in <i>-odes</i> , ...	35
SECTION V.—Of Latin Botanical terms derived from the Greek, ending in <i>-ia</i> and forming the titles of Classes and Orders in the Linnæan and Jussieuan Systems, ...	40
SECTION VI.—Of the <i>Spiritus asper</i> , or aspirate of the Greek, and the misplacement of its symbol, the letter <i>h</i> , in Latin compound terms, and in their English analogues, ...	47

DIVISION II.

COMPRISING TERMS PECULIAR TO THE NOMENCLATURE OF
MEDICAL SCIENCE.

SECTION I.—Of the Pathological term <i>Anasarca</i> , ...	59
SECTION II.—Of the Anatomical term <i>Gastrocnemius</i> , ...	62
SECTION III.—Of the Anatomical term <i>Psalloides</i> , ...	65

	<i>Page.</i>
SECTION IV.—Of the Pathological terms <i>Emprosthotonos</i> , <i>Opisthotonos</i> , and <i>Pleurothotonos</i> , ...	68
SECTION V.—Of the Anatomical term <i>Platysma-Myoides</i> , ...	72
SECTION VI.—Of the terms <i>Acidum</i> , <i>Causticum</i> , &c., ...	75
Of the term <i>Ephemera</i> , ...	76
Of terms applied as distinctive of the qualities of medicines, <i>Narcotics</i> , <i>Antispasmodics</i> , <i>Tonics</i> , &c., ...	77
Of Names of Chemical principles, <i>Fibrine</i> , <i>Stearine</i> , <i>Salicine</i> , &c., ...	<i>ib.</i>
Of the Latin Diphthong <i>æ</i> , and its translation in English terms, ...	79
Of the Anatomical term <i>Lambdoidalis</i> , &c., ...	<i>ib.</i>
Of the Anatomical term <i>Zygoma</i> , ...	81
CONCLUSION, ...	82

DISSERTATION,

ETC., ETC.

INTRODUCTION.

THE substance of the following observations, so far as they have reference to the Nomenclature of Medicine and the several branches of General Science which it involves, was published in the *Lancet*.* This was done to elicit the opinions of my Professional brethren in this country, on the views there promulgated of the faulty condition of certain portions of Medical and General Scientific Language, and on the Suggestions at the same time offered for its improvement.

The request, which was there repeatedly made, to be corroborated where I might be considered right, or corrected where held to be wrong, in those views, was not responded to in a single instance. The series of Papers having been extended to a sixth, and the solicitation to be favoured with the judgment of others on their contents having been from time to time renewed, but in vain, it was then brought to a close. Within a few days afterwards, I was much gratified by the receipt of a Note from the esteemed friend to whom these Pages are inscribed, previously known to me only by name, professing

* Vol. ii., 1846, and Vols. i. and ii., 1847.

much interest in the subject of my Papers, stating, that though he thought me "wrong in some few points, still he believed my Papers would in the end do good," and suggesting that "they should be revised, enlarged, and published in a separate form, which might bring them before the notice of many persons, both in this country and on the Continent, who would not otherwise have an opportunity of seeing them." This suggestion accorded, completely, with my own wish, namely, to subject the whole of my apprehensions to the ordeal of superior acquirements and superior judgment, wheresoever it might be applied. But, being actually engaged in preparing for publication an Expository Lexicon of Scientific Terms, &c., I hesitated as to its adoption, under an idea that a Treatise, or Essay, on the subject, explanatory of the reasons which led to the numerous corrections, alterations, and suggested improvements which will there be found introduced, or pointed out, might be properly enough incorporated with that Work. Further reflection, however, soon convinced me of the superiority of the course advised, for extending, as widely as possible, the means by which my peculiar views may come under the notice of the learned, abroad as well as at home; and, also, for obtaining, what has hitherto been withheld,—the confirmation of these, or their refutation upon just grounds.

In now entering on the consideration of the various topics, I shall observe the order pursued in the series of Papers referred to, not that it is adapted to any particular rule, but rather because none such is applicable.

Much of the Technical language employed in Medicine and its collateral branches of science, possesses, it must be con-

fessed, very slight claims to propriety or correctness. Terms are frequently compounded of the most fanciful and far-fetched ingredients; from the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, Italian, German, Spanish, Arabic, Indian, Japanese, Dutch, Belgic, and Saxon languages, &c. Adjective disagrees with substantive, in gender, if not also in number and case. Substantive is associated with substantive, but, like some ill-matched pair, neither governs or is governed, in any case; the rules of Syntax are set at naught,—Etymology is strained and over-taxed; the dead and the living are linked together in unseemly conjunction. In short, as might be supposed to happen in some newly revolutionised State, instead of possessing an authorised mint and well-assayed sterling currency, each individual coins for himself, according to his occasions and the materials he can command. The effect of all this is, the introduction, from year to year, nay almost from day to day, of many specimens that are rudely shaped and of doubtful quality, and the meaning of whose impress is scarcely discoverable,—of not a few, that are literally base and spurious.

The same may be said of a large portion of the language of General Science, and even of that of ordinary conversation among educated men; for the terms which are employed in one branch soon become common to most of the others, and enter into the phraseology of the Arts and of Handicraft trade; and are used to convey ideas of the most familiar objects around us. Moreover, they are transferred into our English Dictionaries, from the humblest in which they are to be seen at all, to that of the newest and loftiest assumption; and thence, under this apparent sanction of authority, are they made “common as household words.” Thus, a spheroid and an ovoid, are talked

of, written, and printed, as indicating the form of a globe, and of an egg, without a thought that this employment of the words is not, in strict judgment, correct. And so, of a host of others.

Lest it be imagined that the truth is overstrained or exaggerated in this representation, I beg leave to bring forward in its support, a somewhat quaintly expressed opinion taken from the Preface to the work of a Reverend Lexicographer of the seventeenth century, Dr. Adam Littleton.*

“Moreover,” says he, *“those terms, which have been either devised or coined out of the Latin, Greek, or Vulgar Tongues by Schoolmen, Civilians, Physicians, &c., of later times and meaner note, are ranked here,”*—that is, in a separate Glossary of Latin-Barbarous words,—*“(for to the more eminent of these we allow a place in the Class,”*—or Latin-Classic Dictionary,) *“unless they are grown to be of common use, and have some more than ordinary importance.*

“As to the Chymical terms of Paracelsus (which have formerly pestered Latinity) and other strange words used by Men of his Tribe, which have no affinity with Latin or Greek, they are wholly omitted, and not so much as set down among the Barbarous.

“Nor is this omission any disadvantage at all to the Latin Tongue, with which such Writers have little to do in those adventures; who, also, if they intend to be understood, have provided Claves and Keys of their own, whereby their Readers may understand them. Nor ought it to be imputed as a blemish or defect to a Dictionary, that the Writer thereof did not think fit to rake up all the Gibberish that any sort

* Latin Dictionary, 1735.

of Canters have invented to amuse People, and to conceal their own notions."

Alas! for our scholastic reputation, thus thrust from the classic pale, pretensionless, out—out, to somewhere not specified, beyond even the wilds of Barbarism! But his Reverence is hypercritically severe, and I, for one, cannot see why "Schoolmen, Civilians, Physicians, &c., *of later times*" should be ridiculed for creating terms by which to express, more aptly, their meaning, any more than the Grammarians, Poets, Philosophers, &c. of ancient days,—nor why such terms should be stigmatised as "*Barbarous*" and also as "*Gibberish*," provided they have been formed in strict accordance with rule and precedent of "*the Class*."

Having been engaged for several years in endeavouring to improve this objectionable state of our Professional and Scientific Terminology, and, so far as practicable, to bring it more under the regulation of classic laws, the endless investigations necessarily attendant upon the prosecution of my purpose unveiled very many existing defects, inaccuracies, errors, and discrepancies, which, under different circumstances, might probably have altogether escaped notice, or, severally, have been considered too trivial to call for interference. To those, indeed, who casually stumble upon a single instance of error, or inaccuracy, in Scientific Terminology, whether medical or general, the notification of a purpose, prosecuted through a term of years, to effect its correction, may seem trifling and finical rather than useful. But when it is considered that the examples of such defects, inaccuracies, &c., now amount to many thousands, and their numbers are constantly being increased,—

that they are in daily use in Lectures, in Examinations, and in conversation, — that they are to be found interspersed in Works on almost every branch of science, — that they enter into the illustrations of the Pulpit, the deliberations of the Bench, the pleadings of the Bar, the theses of the University, and the prelections of the Class-Room, — that they occur, ever and anon, in the Text-Book and Manual, and in Dictionaries of the highest pretensions, — the importance of the subject cannot be doubted.

Even if the established practitioner, or the man of science, should place small value on the objects of such an investigation, I can state, from personal recollections, that to the educated student, coming, as he generally does, full fraught with notions of classical elegance and classical purity, these errors prove highly offensive. In undertaking the correction of at least some of them, I am prompted by no mere cavilling spirit, but only seek to establish a just arrangement of certain difficulties, with the view of more satisfactorily performing the onerous task before me. Beyond what was really necessary for the accomplishment of this object, which is one, surely, of general interest, natural reluctance to press my own views on public attention, would have forbidden me to proceed. It is right to premise, that I have already consulted men of the highest rank, literary, medical, and scientific, and many friends, well entitled, by their acquirements, to be characterised as classical scholars, — but all to little account. Some bluntly assailed my suggestions as monstrous and absurd: others assented too readily to every thing brought before them: certain granted it to be possible that I might be right, but, careful to avoid the responsibility of even so stinted an admission, guardedly as

needlessly, required that the sanction of their mighty names should not be made use of. A few (doubtless "the judicious"), after particularly attending to the various arguments, *pro* and *con.*, honoured the former with their unqualified approval. While not one would hazard an opinion of his own, nearly all scouted the terms of science as barbarous, being "found in no classical works," an assertion neither literally correct, nor fairly made, but, so far as it is the one or the other, easily met by the fact, that Science in every branch has taken such giant strides since the days of "the Class," that it required, and has formed, almost a new language for itself. Therefore, it seems no less unjust than ungenerous, to deride the framers of that language,—which, "not to speak it profanely," is at this day, perhaps, more important, as it is more generally employed, than the pure Classic—in their attempts to supply what ancient literature certainly does not contain, but what may yet be correctly moulded on the models which it affords. The more classically-given the individual, the more caustic and contemptuous his condemnation; but let Scientific Nomenclature be indeed correctly cast from those models, then will occasion for the learned gibe be materially lessened, if not altogether removed.

How far my labours towards so desirable an end may have been successfully carried to an issue, will be judged when the result is published. In the mean while I experience the misgivings natural to a man, who, conscious of having bestowed all the pains, research, and exercise of judgment of which he is capable, yet feels himself liable to the imputation of presumption, in undertaking to amend a state of things, to which, howsoever faulty, professional and scientific men have,

by long habit, reconciled themselves. Under the full operation of these, I respectfully submit my own ideas on the points to be considered ; and though time admits not of my benefiting, in the forthcoming edition of my Work, by any judicious criticisms with which the contents of these pages may be honoured, I will, on good cause being shown, with pleasure retract one or all of my supposed amendments to be immediately described, at the next opportunity that may be afforded. It need scarcely be added, that it will yield me a higher degree of pleasure, should I be favoured with opinions corroborative of these, or suggestive of further improvement.

The illustrations, in a few instances, will be found closely to approach those of a merely elementary kind. In apology, let me plead that, among the number to whom my intended Work may prove useful, there will probably be some who never learned the Greek language ; others, who have forgotten much of what they did learn ; and both of whom will better understand my meaning by the excessive plainness of the means by which it is in these instances conveyed. For this cause, I trust, the more learned will forgive what might otherwise be offensive.

The following observations are, for the sake of distinction, arranged in two Divisions ; the first comprising those objects of remark occurring in terms that are common to the Nomenclature, not only of Medical but also of General Science : the second containing such as more particularly belong to the Nomenclature of Medicine.

DIVISION I.,

COMPRISING

TERMS COMMON TO THE NOMENCLATURE OF MEDICAL
AND GENERAL SCIENCE.

SECTION I.

OF LATIN TERMS DERIVED FROM THE GREEK, ENDING
IN *-IDES*, AND IN *-IDE*.

IN the Terminology of Medical and General Science, there occur many hundreds of Latin terms compounded from the Greek, and ending in the terminal, or terminating dissyllable, *-ides*, as *Klino-ides* (from κλίνη, a bed; εἶδος, resemblance); *Delto-ides*, *Hyaloides*, &c. This dissyllabic terminal being preceded, with very few exceptions, by the letter *o*, is usually, but erroneously, pronounced in this country as if the *o* and the *i* were intended to produce a diphthongal sound, *-oides*; and such mispronunciation has probably been in some degree induced by the usual mode of uttering the English analogues of these terms, which is certainly of that character, as *Clinoid*, *Deltoid*, *Hyaloid*, &c. But there is no diphthong *oi* in the Latin language; and although the corresponding letters in the Greek, *οι*, really do form a diphthong, it by no means enters into the constitution of the terms under consideration. The *o* forms no integral part of their penultimate syllable, but is supplied, or substituted, at the end of the first or substantive portion of these and numerous other differently compounded

terms, as a convenient link of connection between it and the terminal; while the long $\bar{i}$, in $-ides$, is the proper conversion into Latin of the Greek diphthong $\epsilon\iota$ in $\epsilon\bar{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$. Consistently with this explanation, the few terms of the kind which appear in Greek Lexicons are invariably spelt as in $\Delta\epsilon\nu\delta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\omicron\nu$, a tree; $\epsilon\bar{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$.)

These terms, ending in $-ides$, are so frequently to be met with, that the questions naturally arise,—What is their true grammatical character? Are they adjective or substantive, or both? To what declension are they to be referred, and what is their exact English signification? Questions such as these may probably excite surprise, from the apparent simplicity of the required answers. The statement of a few facts, however, will serve to show that they are by no means so easy of solution as is at first supposed. In Greek Lexicons, the few original terms of this kind which they contain, are presented distinctly as adjective in their quality, ending in “ $\eta\varsigma. \acute{o} \kappa\alpha\iota \eta\varsigma.$ ” In most classical Latin Dictionaries, the still smaller number of the analogues of such of these terms as are to be found in them, are presented without any sign or mark of their quality whatever.* In almost all the Medical Lexicons, Glossaries, Nomenclators, and Dictionaries, there is the same absence of any indication of their grammatical character. As has been stated, they are of frequent occurrence in the various branches of Natural Science, in Medicine, in the descriptive matter connected with the Arts, and in Lectures, and they are now and then introduced into ordinary conversation. But the examples to be now offered I shall take chiefly from the Nomenclature of the Science of Medicine, just because in it are to be found the errors which it is my object to expose, more deliberately and conspicuously put forward than any where else. Take Hooper’s Medical Dictionary, for instance, being one of the most modern in this country (excepting Hoblyn’s and Dr. Palmer’s Pentaglot Dictionary, which, for obvious reasons, I

* Since the above was written I have discovered one term entered thus, “Sphæroecides. Adj.,” on the authority of Boëtius and also of Vitruvius.

have refrained from consulting); and here let me state, that the selection of this useful Work for remark is influenced by no invidious feeling whatever, but is made solely, because the manner adopted in its pages of setting forth these terms, (in which respect it is decidedly superior to the rest), serves more effectually than any other for the exhibition of the faults prevalent in all of them, and for the illustration of my precise meaning in attempting their correction. In Hooper's Dictionary,* then, the three compound Greek derivative terms above noted are entered thus:—

1. "CLINOID. (*Clinoides*; from κλινη, a bed, and εἶδος, resemblance.) Resembling a bed." &c.

2. "DELTOIDES. (*Deltoides* and *Deltoideus*; from δελτα, the Greek letter Δ, and εἶδος, a likeness: shaped like the Greek delta.) The name of a muscle of the superior extremity situated on the shoulder."

3. "HYALOID. (*Hyaloides*; from ὑαλος, glass, and εἶδος, likeness.) Transparent, like glass."

Now, what information of the kind desired can be gathered from such entries, or what can be more vague and unsatisfactory? In the 1st example, we are told that the Latin for Clinoid is *Clinoides*, and its Greek etyma are given, but not a hint of its quality, status, or character in grammar. In the 2nd, it is made to appear, simply enough, that *Deltoides* is synonymous with *Deltoides*, and also with *Deltoideus*, (a misconception to be afterwards noticed†); next comes its derivation, but no allusion to rank, nor, singular to observe, the least trace of its familiar English analogue, Deltoid; then it is stated to be "*the name of a muscle*," &c. But how can it be considered a name, with any degree of propriety? The idiom of a language may, indeed, warrant the use, in anatomical parlance, of the *Deltoides*,—or of its English analogue, the Deltoid,—as distinguishing a particular muscle; still, neither of

* The 7th Edition, 1839, is that here quoted from.

† See Div. I., Sect. ii., page 26.

these terms can be truly said to be the name of it or of any other object, for they equally apply to many other objects, but only indicate the adjective quality of a certain form or shape.* In the 3rd, Hyaloid is rendered *Hyaloides*, but is otherwise equally uninformative.

In the same defective and incorrect manner all the terms so compounded, which are to be found in that Work, are treated, without direction, or one word of explanation on the important point of their grammatical character, and hence with a very vague and often erroneous definition. And it is thus that the compilers of English Dictionaries, even of latest date, have transferred into their columns the analogues of such terms, with all their faults, quite as they found them. French Dictionaries are superior to our own, in offering at least some account of the matter, though, sooth to say, that is none of the best, generally representing these terms in a twofold form, as,—“Deltoide, adj., *deltoideus*, *deltoides*, *deltoidalis*,” committing the same error as is found in Hooper, of making *deltoideus* a synonyme of *deltoides*, which it is not,† and adding a new one of their own, *deltoidalis*,‡ which happily we know nothing of,—and “Deltoides, adj. et s. m. pl., *Deltoidea*,”§ here again confounding *deltoides* with the nominative plural neuter of *deltoideus*, which is quite a distinct term.|| But this is a disposal, not a solution of the difficulty, and quite as unsatisfactory as the rest.

It is remarkable that, while of the large number of Latin terms now in use, compounded of *εἶδος* and ending in *-ides*,

* Once for all, let it be understood that I find no fault with that license of idiomatic expression, by which adjectives are employed substantively in speech and in writing. But I unqualifiedly condemn, as inexcusable, the error by which the former are specially represented in Dictionaries, as nouns substantive, on no other ground than this conventional use of them. The point comes repeatedly under remark in these pages, therefore this Note seems necessary.

† See Div. I., Sect. ii., page 26.

‡ See Div. II., Sect. vi., page 79.

§ Jourdan.

|| See Div. I., Sect. ii., page 26.

several of the Greek analogues have been inserted in the more modern Lexicons,* very few indeed are to be found in those of older date. In truth, as a family group they have much less of a classical reputation to boast of than another set, (those ending in *-odes*, to be afterwards considered,†) which they, in numerous instances and without any good reason, have been made to supplant. Few as they are, however, among ancient writers, they unquestionably constitute the models after which by far the greater proportion of similarly applicable terms have been more recently created, or continue to be invented, among ourselves.

It appears pretty evident also, that lexicographers, whether medical, classical, or scientific, have avoided a subject which they, perhaps, cared not to take the trouble of investigating: or, finding it involved in some obscurity, they chose, by a discreet silence, to let matters rest as they were, rather than to hazard their reputation for learning, by acting on any decision of their own. Wherefore, and having derived no enlightenment whatever from the learned living, I venture to offer my own views of the grammatical character of Latin compound terms ending in *-ides*, with the reasons on which my conclusions are severally founded.

The few original Greek analogues of these terms occurring in the older Lexicons, as well as the additions made to them in those of later publication, are beyond doubt adjective. In every such work which I have consulted, they are distinguished by the adjective termination and character, “ὁ καὶ ἡ,” their definition is almost invariably rendered into Latin, as “*habens speciem*,” having the likeness of, or “*habens figuram*,” having the figure of, or as “*similis*,” like to, some object denoted by the former portion of the word; and they are stated to be derived from the Greek word for that object, and εἶδος, signifying resemblance, or likeness. The addition, “ὁ καὶ ἡ,” equivalent to *Hic et hæc* of the Latin, or to m. and f., simply indi-

* Hederici Lexicon, by Morell; see also Donnegan's, Liddell and Scott's, &c.

† See Div. I., Sect. iv., page 35.

cates their being like $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\eta\varsigma$, $\eta\varsigma$, $\epsilon\varsigma$, which forms an example in most Greek grammars of the mode of declining adjectives of this termination. Nor is it of importance, that the neuter is not mentioned. It is always understood by the masculine and feminine only being given, such being the mode adopted in the older Lexicons of distinguishing adjectives of two terminations.* Is it not manifest, then, that the signification, Latin or English, of these and all other similarly compounded terms, is adjective, requiring in every instance a noun in agreement, to be expressed or understood? Upon the grounds stated, I deferentially submit, that every Latin compound term derived from $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ and ending in *-ides* is to be regarded, not as a noun, or “the name” of any object, but as an adjective of one termination, belonging to the third declension,—that it is applicable to a noun, or name of a thing, and denotes the resemblance of that thing to some object signified by the first part of the compound, as, in the example *Deltoides*, to the Greek letter Δ , or a triangle, or (as it is actually applied in Botany) to a trowel; such adjectives in $\tilde{\epsilon}s$ or $\tilde{\epsilon}s$, according to the Latin rule, having no neuter plural, and seldom or never the neuter singular.† Hence their unchanged termination, whatever be the gender of the word to which they are applied, and we thus have *Mastoides* (*processus*) in the masculine, *Sigmoides* (*flexura*) in the feminine, and *Cuboides* (*os*) for the neuter. From the fact that they are not to be found employed by Latin authors, in any other termination than that of the nominative singular, they must be concluded to be further indeclinable; and where it was necessary to use them, or rather, to express their meaning in the plural, recourse has been had to the expedient of forming other adjectives on their model ending in *-ideus*, to be immediately considered, as *Sesamoidea* (*ossa*), &c., an expedient, however, improperly resorted to in this and also in many other instances explained in the next Section.

* Among the modern Lexicons, Donnegan gives terms in $-\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$, thus,— $\kappa\upsilon\beta\omicron\omicron\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$, $\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, Adj.; Liddell and Scott present them simply as, $\kappa\upsilon\beta\omicron\omicron\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$.

† Eton Latin Grammar, by Edwards.

An objection has been offered to the view just stated, which I feel bound to bring forward. It rests on the fact that Castellus, in his Medical Lexicon, under the word *Sesamoidea*, adds its Greek synonyme, *σησαμοειδέα*, which can be regarded only as the nominative plural neuter of *σησαμοειδής*; and hence, it has been argued, that *sesamoidea* is not the parallel case of *Sesamoideus* (as it is assumed to be in the next Section), but of *Sesamoides*, contrary to the opinion here advanced. Now, with all the force that can be given to this fact, even if it were as substantial as my respected objectors suppose, it amounts to very little. It only shows that Castellus, when about to define the term *Sesamoidea*, put down in this, as he has done in all similar instances, the corresponding word in the Greek, much as a matter of course and with no special reference to their close resemblance, and he then proceeded to explain the application of the word to the *Ossicula* of the hand and foot. His account of the *Sesamoidea ossa* is drawn from certain passages in the works of Galen and Bartholini, where the term has been employed, but this does not go one step to prove *Sesamoidea* to be the nominative plural neuter of *Sesamoides*. The use made of *Sesamoidea* by Galen and Bartholini is in no way inconsistent with the views already expressed as to the terms in *-ides*; neither is so, the insertion of the Greek synonyme (it is not a perfect analogue) by Castellus, in its nominative plural neuter, which I strongly incline to think was a purely accidental circumstance, rather than intended to denote that the Latin term was its strictly literal translation,—in other phrase, its true analogue. Bartholini also made use of the term *Arytænoides*,* but are we, therefore, to conclude that this too is a case of *Arytænoides*? If so, where is to be found its parallel termination in *Ἀρυταινοειδής*?

Gorræus, in his Definitions, presents the Greek synonyme thus, *Σησαμοειδῆ ὀστέα* (for *ὀστέα*) in the same case of the nominative plural neuter, but it is to be recollected that, though in the Greek this case would be properly enough set down as

* Anat. : lib. ii., c. 11, page 442.

corresponding to *Sesamoidea* in the Latin; and though there is a very close coincidence in the spelling of the two words, yet we are distinctly taught, that Latin adjectives of one termination in *ēs* or in *ēs*, “have seldom or never the neuter gender in the singular number and very rarely in the plural.”* The occurrence of these two synonyms in connection with each other in *Castellus* (supposing it to be really what is implied in the objection), cannot warrant us in deciding *Sesamoidea* to be the very rare exception to this rule, nor to be a case of *Sesamoides*, any more than *Arytænoidei* is one of *Arytænoides*, which is nowhere pretended. We must attend to the proprieties of the Latin in the things which belong to it, though in so doing we may clash with the rules and usages of another language, as is frequently done. Therefore it can hardly be that *Sesamoidea* is the nominative plural neuter of *Sesamoides*, there being no parallel instance to be found, it is believed, of the employment of a word of such a termination, which can bear the construction of its being a case of a term in *-ides* at all; it may much more probably be held to be this case of *Sesamoideus*, because this were in strict analogy with the course adopted as to all the rest of the terms in *-ideus*. Hooper thus viewed it; but even if greater weight could be given to the objection under discussion, that is to say, if *Sesamoidea* were declared to be the plural neuter, not of a Latin adjective, but of the Greek *σησαμοειδής*, oddly put in Roman letters and agreeing with *ossa* in all respects as a Latin adjective would do, still, while presenting a solitary and most remarkable instance of the kind, the objection founded upon it could not affect, it could not apply to, the large number of similar terms in constant use, which are indubitably Latin adjectives of the first and second declensions. It is just barely possible, that, after all, *Sesamoidea* may constitute the very rare exceptional example referred to, of the neuter plural of *Sesamoides*; and this, I submit, were a far more consistent idea than that of regarding it to be the Greek word itself, as has been suggested, only put in Roman

* Edwards' Eton Latin Grammar.

letters. It is an idea, however, which, as has been shown, would be at variance with analogy.

The terminal *-ide*, as a derivative of εἶδος, occurs in a few terms, as *Cancroide*, *Deltoide*, *Kiloide*, &c., in respect to which it is only necessary to say, such terms are from the French, that *-ide* is but *-ides* in its Gallic dress, and that therefore they need not be adopted by English writers.

SECTION II.

OF LATIN TERMS FORMED FROM GREEK DERIVATIVES,
ENDING IN *-IDEUS*.

A PRETTY numerous set of terms, in frequent use, and closely connected with those in *-ides*, being derived directly from them, end in the terminal *-ideus*. The change of the final syllable *-es* of the former, into *-eus* of the latter, is effected on no authority peculiar to the Greek, but seems to be merely an imitation of the familiar Latin termination of an adjective in *-us*, of the first and second declensions. There has hitherto existed this difference in pronunciation between the words in *-ideus* derived from *-ides*, and those not of Greek origin but ending in the same three letters, *-eus*, that the penult *e*, instead of being pronounced short, as it must be by position, has always been erroneously given in the former as if it preserved the character of long $\bar{e}$, or the representative of η of the Greek, as in the terminal *-idēs*. Thus, they are invariably pronounced as if *Deltoidēs*, *Mastoidēs*, &c., the error evidently originating in the circumstance just noticed. All Latin adjectives, having the termination *-eus*, invariably express relation to some object, or substance, indicated by the preceding portion of each, as *Cretaceus*, from *creta*, chalk; of chalk, chalky: *Plumbeus*, from *plumbum*, lead; of lead, leaden: *Lapideus*, from *lapis*, a stone; of stone, stony, &c.

Terms so derived and formed, it is clear, can never with propriety be ranked as *synonymes* of those on which they are modeled, although, apparently, a contrary opinion has been very generally acted on. Each has, or rather, as will be made evident, ought to have, the simple adjective quality,—of or belonging to,—whatever be the object to which its prototypal term in *-ides* is applied. Each, also, has the signification, not

of resemblance to a thing, but of *relation* to *that* which bears such resemblance. This is made plain in our English translation of terms in *-ideus*, by the adoption of, so far, a literal and very convenient analogue, as Arytenoidean (of *arytenoideus*), which distinctly means, not Arytenoid (*arytenoides*), as it would do, if synonymous with it, but, pertaining to *that* which is arytenoid, or funnel-shaped. Their substitution for the original terms themselves, therefore, so frequently occurring in the nomenclature of general science, to convey the same quality specially belonging to *them*, is erroneous. With the exception of a very few, which are peculiar to one branch of medical science, (and which probably may have led to the misapplication of the rest in that and in other branches), they would have been better and more correctly preserved in their true (and classical) terminal form of *-ides*. The branch of medical science referred to, is Anatomy, in which alone, it appears, the compound derivative terms under consideration are usefully and rightly employed.

To place these remarks in a stronger light, let us again have recourse to illustration, by examples. Hooper repeatedly presents terms ending in *-ides*, and in *-ideus*, as being synonymous. For instance:—

1. "ARYTÆ'NOID. (*Arytenoides*; often improperly called *arytenoideus*; from *αρυταινα*, a funnel, and *ειδος*, shape.) Funnel-shaped: applied to two cartilages of the larynx, and also to the muscles, glands, &c. connected with these cartilages."

The next has been already quoted, but for a different purpose,* viz.:—

2. "DELTOI'DES. (*Deltoides* and *Deltoideus*; from *δελτα*, the Greek letter Δ, and *ειδος*, a likeness: shaped like the Greek delta. 1. The name of a muscle," &c. But immediately after this there appears,—"DELTOIDEUS. Improperly written for *Deltoides*."

3. "MA'STOID. (*Mastoideus*; from *μαστος*, a breast, and *ειδος*, resemblance.) Nipple-like. 1. Those processes of bone

* See Div. I., Sect. i., page 19.

are so termed that are shaped like the nipple of the breast; as the mastoid process of the temporal bone, &c. 2. The name of a muscle, from its being inserted into the mastoid process," &c.

These definitions present a confused jumble of what ought to have been kept separate and distinct. In the first example it is stated, that *Arytenoides* is "often improperly called *Arytenoideus*," and, without doubt, whenever this is done, a very egregious blunder is committed; but the assertion is too sweeping, for it implies that *Arytenoideus* cannot be properly employed at all, even as a separate term having reference to a special quality, distinct from that expressed by the word of which it is said to be a misnomer. It implies, besides, that Arytenoid is the only correct term to apply "to the muscles, glands, &c." If such were really the case, how could this term, Arytenoid, or *funnel-shaped*, be applied to muscles consisting of a few muscular fibres only, or to glands of a round, an oval, or a lobulated form, none of these having the slightest approach to the shape of a funnel? In the second, *Deltoides* and *Deltoides* are first given as synonymes, and as "the name of a muscle," but in the very next article of the column, "*Deltoides*" again appears as "Improperly written for *deltoides*." There is a confusion, as has been observed, in the definitions of these two examples, which almost precludes the practicability of properly exhibiting their discrepancies; for, while in each, the compound terms in *-ides*, and in *-ideus*, are set forth and to all intents and purposes maintained as synonymes, it is at the same time declared that the latter are "improperly called" or "written" for the former. And not only so, but the plain inference left to be drawn is, that they are false and useless terms. In the third example, however, less of confusion, and no such inconsistency, nor attribution of impropriety, occurs. *Mastoideus* is distinctly given as the Latin analogue of Mastoid, signifying nipple-like, and is stated to be applied to processes of bone so shaped, and to—"2. The name of a muscle," &c. Here, then, is a new view, from which it would

appear that terms ending in *-ideus* are not so improper, after all, but may take the place of those in *-ides*, and be also applied, as aptly as the latter can be, to the very same objects which they (the latter) are employed to characterise.

Could any set of definitions of the same thing be more manifestly discrepant in themselves, more carelessly rendered, or more inconsistent with each other? Yet, the vague and unsettled condition of Scientific Terminology which they exhibit, is conspicuous in all works on the various subjects in explanation of which it is made use of. In Anatomy, Botany, Ichthyology, Ornithology, &c., the faulty substitution of terms in *-ideus*, for their prototypes in *-ides*, is of frequent occurrence. The only branch of medical science in which the former are fitly employed, is, as already stated, Anatomy; and in farther endeavouring to describe their true nature, the fact of their inapplicability in other branches, and the error of their being made to supplant the more legitimate compounds in *-ides*, both in them and to some extent in this, will, it is believed, be made apparent. I would again disclaim all invidiousness in exposing errors and defects in the particular Work from which the examples adduced have been taken: my object is to show what irreconcilable differences are to be found on this single point, even where one might have expected to appeal successfully for direction,—as establishing strong grounds in justification of the attempt in which I have engaged.

Anatomical and all other compound terms ending in *-ides* and derived from $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$, have reference to a resemblance to particular objects, to which the parts, animals, or things they are applied to, bear likeness. Terms ending in *-ideus*, on the other hand, are derived, not directly from $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$, but from those very compounds in *-ides*, as their prototypes; and have no such reference to resemblance, but possess the adjective quality, or signification,—of or belonging to—the parts, animals, or things themselves, to which the terms in *-ides* are applied, and *not* the objects they resemble. This, it is conceived, is

especially evident in most of those introduced into the Nomenclature of Anatomy, to which branch, indeed, of medical science, their proper use seems peculiar. And it appears to be quite within the scope of probability, that this original and correct employment of both sets of terms becoming, in the hands of the careless, less and less guided by strict adherence to just views, they began to be confounded one with another, and so, gave rise to the introduction into the language of General Science, and of Anatomy itself,* of imitations of them in their former and legitimate, as well as in their latter, and, for the purposes to which they have been applied, their erroneous form.

To be more explicit:—The term *Arytenoides*, signifying funnel-shaped, or arytenoid, is well enough applied to two cartilages of the larynx, because of their supposed resemblance to such an instrument. *Arytenoideus*, however, which is modelled from *Arytenoides*, instead of being a synonyme of like application, possesses the adjective quality,—of or belonging to—that which is funnel-shaped. Applied to a muscle it requires the word *musculus* to be understood, and then it denotes the Arytenoidean muscle, a name given to a few muscular fibres, because they are—*of or belonging to*, related to, or connected with, the *Arytenoides* (*cartilagine*s being understood), or Arytenoid cartilages. In like manner, *Deltoideus* will truly, indeed, be very “improperly written for *deltoides*,” because the latter means triangular-shaped, or trowel-shaped, and (*musculus* being understood in agreement,) is tolerably well applied to a muscle of the shoulder whose outline has somewhat of this form, while the former, as here employed, can only indicate something *of or belonging to* that muscle. Thus, we cannot correctly speak, or write, of the Deltoidean muscle, for this means more than simple likeness to the Greek letter Δ , viz., *relation to*, or connection with, some object having such likeness; but it will be perfectly in accordance with propriety to say, the Deltoidean attachments, region, vessels,

* See Div. I., Sect. i., page 22, near the bottom.

nerves, prominence, &c. *Mastoideus* is subject to the same remarks as have been made on *Deltoideus*. No similar objection to that stated to *Arytenoideus* and *Deltoideus*, however, has been offered to *Mastoideus*, yet, unquestionably, it will be as improperly put for *Mastoides*, as they, for their respective prototypes. Moreover, it is a remarkable fact, that this legitimate classical term, *Mastoides*, is not to be found at all in the Work quoted from, but that there appears in its place, what can only be its derivative, *Mastoideus*, blindly copied from preceding authorities, it would seem, without discriminating between the application to an object which belongs to the nipple-like or mastoidean process, and one which is itself nipple-like or mastoid.

On the whole,—would it not be egregious nonsense to say, that the Arytenoidean muscle is like a funnel; that the small nerves, or vessels, supplying the prominence of the shoulder, are like the letter Δ ; or that the Sterno-cleido-mastoidean muscle, in the least resembles a nipple? But not so, that the first is connected with, or attached to, the Arytenoid cartilages; that the second are proper to the Deltoid muscle; or that the third belongs to the Mastoid process. The same kind of reasoning may be applied to all such terms.

It is only necessary to add, that the quantity of the penultimate syllable, in all these terms, must, although contrary to long usage, be rendered short.

SECTION III.

OF LATIN TERMS DERIVED FROM THE GREEK, ENDING
IN *-ADÆ*, *-IDÆ*, AND *-IDA*.

A COMPREHENSIVE set of compound terms, ending in *-adæ*, *-idæ*, and *-ida*, is to be found among the distinctive titles bestowed by some authors on the Orders, Families, and Genera of that branch of Natural History called Zoölogy,—as *Columbadæ*, *Grallidæ*, and *Percidæ*, with a considerable number of others, of similar termination respectively. As to the true quality, or character in grammar of such terms, no satisfactory information is any where afforded. They are freely employed by writers and instructors, for the purposes and in the branch of Natural History referred to, but their real status in language, their precise meaning, mode of pronunciation, or any certain guide for their being rightly employed, is nowhere indicated. All pertaining to them, in these respects, is left to be guessed at and misconceived as it may, by him who has occasion to use them. In fact, they stand in the same predicament as those ending in *-ides* already treated of;* no grammatical condition, so far as known, has been hitherto assigned to them, but they appear, when they do appear, in Dictionaries new and old, in Glossaries, in Medical Lexicons, in Nomenclators, &c., bare and unexplained. French Dictionaries of Science, it is true, include many of them, but they are there dealt with in the same accommodating way as pointed out in the case of those in *-ides*; being each described to be “Adj. et s. m. pl.”;† Gallic lexicographers thus seeking to remove one existing difficulty by creating two in its place, namely, that of finding the term invested with two characters, and

* See Div. I., Sect. i., page 17.

† Jourdan

again, that of distinguishing between these, when the word is met with.

In more recently endeavouring to obtain light from other minds on the subject, generally, of these observations, this particular department of it was specially detailed with all the reasoning available for and against the views to be here expressed. The valuable opinions which were in consequence elicited, have induced me to set aside my own view, formerly entertained as to the true character of the terms here presented for consideration, and to adopt one previously rejected, namely, that by which they are to be regarded as Patronymic nouns. While I admit that the assigning of this character to them forms, in a great degree, a satisfactory arrangement of the difficulty which besets them, there are yet certain points in reference to these terms, with which it cannot easily be reconciled. Such, however, may probably be attributable to the faulty construction of individual terms, rather than to the inapplicability of the Patronymic character to them as a whole, and I most readily yield to the high classical authorities who have honoured me by the exercise of their judgment, and by their unanimous decision on this matter.

The terms in *-adæ*, *-idæ*, and *-ida*, are held to be imitations, faulty and objectionable in several respects they certainly are, but still imitations of the classical Patronymic noun, like *Æneădæ*, Trojans, so called from *Æneas*; *Atrīdæ*, the sons of Atreus; *Romŭlīdæ*, the Romans, from their first king Romulus, &c. Before proceeding farther, and the better to understand the question, it may be desirable to enquire, what are the distinguishing marks or characteristics of a Patronymic noun, and then try to ascertain how far the examples stated are in accordance with them.

“A patronymic noun is a substantive derived from a substantive proper, signifying one’s pedigree, or extraction, as *Priamides*, the son of Priamus; *Priamis*, the daughter of Priamus; *Æetias*, the daughter of *Æetas*; *Nerine*, the daughter of Nereus. Patronymics are generally derived from the name

of the father, but also from the grandfather, or some other remarkable person of the family; sometimes from the founder of a nation or people, and also from countries and cities, as *Æacides*, the son, grandson, great-grandson, or one of the posterity of *Æacus*; *Sicelis*, *Troas*, a woman of Sicily, of Troy,* &c. Nouns of this kind, then, invariably signify pedigree from a person or people, or extraction from a city or country; but the terms in question do not possess the requisites thus laid down,—they do not indicate pedigree, or extraction, from person or place,—they do not even apply to human beings, but to Orders, Families, and Genera of the lower animals, quadrupeds, fishes, birds, reptiles, &c. Nevertheless, it is considered that, howsoever the case may stand in the Classics, as to the limits to be observed in the formation of patronymics, the expedient of adopting imitations of certain of them, applicable to the inferior animals and to be employed in the Nomenclature of Science, has, for convenience' sake, and by a very pardonable license, been resorted to.

These remarks apply, in a more particular manner, to the first two sets of the terms under notice—those in *-adæ* and *-idæ*. The third or last set, or such as end in *-ida*, are, in the view now entertained, altogether erroneous, and can only be supposed to have arisen from ignorance, or from a careless use of the terminating letter *a* for the diphthong *æ*,—the comparatively few terms which end in *-ida* being one and all improperly employed for those in *-idæ*.

Terms in *-adæ* and *-idæ*, then, are intended to be imitations of Patronymic substantive nouns, signifying a family or group of animals connected with each other, by some general points of similarity in their form, appearance, or habits. Those ending in *-ida* must be held to have been inaccurately put for the others in *-idæ*.

* Ruddiman; all others give a similar explanation.

SECTION IV.

OF LATIN TERMS DERIVED FROM THE GREEK,
ENDING IN *-ODES*.

THIS dissyllable, *-odes*, which is of comparatively rare occurrence in Scientific Terminology, has, in several of the instances in which it does occur, (in Pathology chiefly,) become confounded with the dissyllabic terminal *-ides*, already considered,* as *Phlegmonodes*, *Erysipelatodes*, *Impetiginodes*, *Icterodes*, &c. It is the direct analogue of one in the Greek, very frequently to be met with as a component of adjective terms in that language, viz., *-ώδης*, which denotes excess, redundancy, fulness, as *Αιματώδης*, having much or full of blood; *Δαφνώδης*, having many laurels, set with laurels; *Νεφελώδης*, full of clouds, cloudy, &c. It is also analogous to the terminating syllables of numerous adjectives in the Latin, *-osus*, corresponding to the English *-ous*, as *Fructus*, fruit; *fructuosus*, abounding in fruit, or fructuous; *Porus*, a pore, or little hole; *porosus*, full of pores, or porous.

The first example above offered, of the erroneous translation given to words ending in *-odes*, is *Phlegmonodes*, which Hooper renders, briefly, as follows:—

“*Erysipelas phlegmonodes*. Phlegmonoid erysipelas.”

The derivation is evidently, (though not a syllable is expressed on the point,) from *φλεγμονή*, inflammation, or tumour with inflammation, and *εἶδος*, resemblance. This etymology and explanation, however, I am inclined to think are incorrect; the term *Phlegmonodes* having no foundation in *εἶδος*, nor any distinct signification of resemblance. It is only the simple Latin analogue of *φλεγμονώδης*, signifying, having inflammation, or conjoined with inflammation, or, better still, tumour or

* See Div. I., Sect. i., page 17.

swelling, (which its root also signifies,) conjoined with inflammation, and is translated into English, phlegmonous; from φλεγμονή, inflammation, or tumour. Therefore, it cannot have any such translation as phlegmonoid, or *resembling* phlegmon; and, although such a meaning may be included in the general sense of a word signifying possession of the quality of phlegmon, still, it cannot correctly be expressed as its strict meaning. It is admitted that Greek words in ὥδης are sometimes made to signify *resemblance* to a certain object; and that in some modern Lexicons* they are inserted as synonymous with the terms in οειδής. The first of these two circumstances, I conceive to be exceptional only as the result of a necessity which existed when the term in ὥδης alone was in use, and when it therefore included, or was held to include, in its general meaning the quality of likeness. The latter, I imagine to have proceeded from oversight, or misapprehension, for where both terms are given in older Lexicons† the distinction between them is duly preserved, as in the examples quoted on next page. But, even if the case were different in the Greek, yet, since both phlegmonoid and phlegmonous are actually and distinctively in use, though they have been confounded together in medical literature, recourse must be had to two separate terms as the Latin analogues of both respectively, viz., the one *Phlegmonoides*, formed of φλεγμονή, and εἶδος, on the model of terms in *-ides*, and the other *Phlegmonodes*, simply a derivative of φλεγμονή. Thus the two words and their respective significations, *Phlegmonodes*, having tumour or swelling conjoined with inflammation, or, as it ought to have been more consistently and more simply translated, phlegmonous; and *Phlegmonoides*, resembling phlegmon, or phlegmonoid, are strikingly distinct from each other in their meaning and application. It will be plain from hence, that the name given to a species of the disease Erysipelas, viz., *Erysipelas phlegmonodes*, and absurdly translated “Phlegmonoid erysipelas,”‡ does not at all mean Ery-

* See Liddell and Scott's.

† See Morell's Hedericus, &c.

‡ Hooper.

sipelas “resembling phlegmon,” as this incorrect translation implies, but Erysipelas having swelling or tumour conjoined with inflammation.

The second example, *Erysipelatodes*, stands exactly in the same circumstances as the preceding, being also falsely translated, and appearing in the Dictionary which has been so often quoted from, thus:—

“ERYSIPELATOID. (*Erysipelatodes*; from ερυσιπελας, and εἶδος, likeness.) Resembling erysipelas.”

This constitutes a blunder which, from what has been stated, becomes conspicuously manifest on the slightest examination. In this example, likewise, there must be two distinct terms, *Erysipelatodes*, having or conjoined with erysipelas, or erysipelalous; and *Erysipelatoides*, resembling erysipelas, or erysipelatoid.

The third and fourth examples, *Impetiginodes*, and *Icterodes*, are but imitations of the others, and fall under the same remarks which have been passed on them. There are several others, much employed in medical science, (and these are of course the most familiar, in a professional view,) but what has been advanced will serve to regulate the character and signification of all such terms, in whatever branch of science they may be used. They are always to be carefully distinguished from the terms in *-ides*, as has now been attempted to be done, and in order to guard against the misuse hitherto made of them by their indiscriminate employment, the expedient of adopting, into scientific nomenclature, both sets,—springing as they do, to a certain extent, from the same origin, but differing in some degree from each other in their etymology, meaning, and application,—may, with perfect propriety, be had recourse to. The justness of this view, is amply testified by the existence of a large number of classical terms simply derived from a noun, and ending in *-ώδης*, or in the analogous terminal of the Latin *-odes* on the one hand, and compounded of the same noun and *εἶδος* and ending in *-εἰδής*, or the Latin *-ides*, on the other; as *Δαφνώδης*, or *Daphnodes*, having, or set with laurels; full of

laurels; *Δαφνοειδής*, or *Daphnoeides*, or more generally *Daphnoides*, resembling the laurel; *Καλαμώδης*, or *Calamodes*, full of reeds; *Καλαμοειδής*, or *Calamoeides*, or *Calamoides*, resembling a reed; *Νεφελώδης*, or *Nephelodes*, having many clouds; *Νεφελοειδής*, or *Nepheloeides*, or *Nepheloides*, resembling a cloud, &c. It has already been admitted, that many words ending in *-ώδης* necessarily bear an interpretation of likeness or appearance, in addition to, or rather involved in, their general adjective meaning of redundancy, &c. Thus, the signification, in English, of *νεφελώδης*, or *nephelodes*, having many clouds, cloudy, or nephelous, includes likeness or appearance as well as fulness or excess of clouds,—but this is altogether apart from the idea of special *resemblance* and nothing more, which is explicitly conveyed by the compound term *νεφελοειδής*, or *nepheloides*, and cannot warrant the bestowment on the former in Dictionaries, Glossaries, and Lexicons, of a translation which belongs to the latter alone, namely, nepheloid, or resembling a cloud,—and so may be said of every pair of similarly constructed terms.

The preceding observations have reference, more particularly, to the improper substitution of words in *-odes* in the room of those in *-ides*; but it is no less the fact, that the latter are sometimes, and with equal impropriety, made to represent the former. A very palpable instance of this occurs in the employment of the word *Myoides*, a term that is quite legitimate in itself, and, in its construction, in accordance with classical precedent, being derived from *μῦς*, a muscle, and *εἶδος*, resemblance, and signifying—resembling muscle or flesh; flesh-like, or myoid. This term is falsely placed, however, in the familiar compound name given by anatomists to a broad, thin, musculous expansion, situated on the neck, viz., *Platysma-Myoides*. The word *Myoides*, as will be seen when the compound term just mentioned, of which it forms a part, is brought under consideration in its proper place,* is incorrectly put for *Myodes*, a classical term of exactly the same nature with those

* Div. II., Sect. v., page 72.

considered in the previous portion of this Section, and signifying, having muscle, or conjoined with muscle or flesh; muscular, or, to give it a more consistent and closely analogous translation, musculous.

The grammatical character of all terms in *-odes*, like those in *-ides*, is that of adjectives of one termination, of the third declension; having "very rarely" the neuter plural and "seldom or never" the neuter singular.

SECTION V.

OF LATIN BOTANICAL TERMS DERIVED FROM THE GREEK,
ENDING IN *-IA* AND FORMING THE TITLES OF CLASSES AND
ORDERS IN THE LINNÆAN AND JUSSIEUAN SYSTEMS.

THE derivatives now to be examined, are those applied to distinguish the divisions into Classes and Orders, forming the Sexual System of Botany, or that instituted by Linnæus; several of them being adopted in the Natural System, otherwise called Jussieuan, or the arrangement of plants according to Jussieu. Hitherto, they have been characterised, where any grammatical character has been given them, as nouns feminine of the first declension, thus:—

“PENTA’NDRIA, (*a*, æ. f.; from *πεντε*, five, and *ανηρ*, a husband.) The name of a class of plants in the sexual system of Linnæus,” &c.

The same explanation, as applicable to each, is given to the rest. In pronouncing an opinion that this character does not belong, but has been erroneously assigned to them, I fear that, from the familiar intimacy with which they have long been regarded, its promulgation will be received with no small portion of doubt and surprise. Nevertheless, such an apprehension must not be allowed to deter me from endeavouring to establish the correctness of this opinion, as an important part of my present purpose.

These terms have no classical existence, but appear to have been invented for one, and partially employed in the other, of the two Systems of Botany mentioned, to illustrate their peculiar arrangements. Those which are intended to distinguish the Linnæan Classes, from the first to the fifteenth inclusive, indicate the number of Stamens, or emblematic organs of the male, existing distinct from the pistil and from each other in

hermaphrodite flowers. The first Class, accordingly, has been entitled *Monandria*, from *μόνος*, one; *ἀνὴρ*, a man, as the sign or emblem of the stamen. The second, *Diandria*, from *δῖς*, twice or double, and *ἀνὴρ*. The third, *Triandria*, from *τρεῖς*, three; and so on with the remaining twelve, varying the first, or first two syllables, to correspond with the number of stamens. In like manner the terms applied to the Orders, from the first to the thirteenth inclusive, denote the number of pistils, or distinctive organs of the female in hermaphrodite flowers. The first is *Monogynia*, from *μόνος*, one; *γυνή*, a woman, the emblem of the pistil. The second, *Digynia*; the third *Trigynia*; as in the Classes, but representing the number of pistils. It is unnecessary to advert to the Classes and Orders of the Linnæan System which succeed to the numbers stated, further than to say, that they differ from them only in composition, and that the views of their grammatical status, to be presently offered, if correct, will equally affect the whole.

One and all of these Linnæan titles of Botanical classification, must, I venture to assume, from their meaning, application, termination, and from analogy, be regarded, not in any light as nouns, but as compound adjective terms of the first and second declensions, having for their termination, *-us*, *-a*, *-um*. It is impossible to attach to them any distinct and in itself complete signification otherwise. These assertions are proposed to be justified on the grounds stated; and,

1. By their *meaning*. Let us take that applied to the first Linnæan Class, *Monandria*, from *μόνος*, one; and *ἀνὴρ*, the word chosen to represent the stamen. If this term were really a noun feminine, as represented, its signification, to give the simplest scarcely admissible effect to the first constituent of the compound, could only be, *one stamen*. But even this is a perfect example of an adjective in agreement with a substantive. If, again, to reduce the term still further down to the standard of a noun, the indefinite article be substituted for the numeral adjective, we, indeed, apparently obtain a tolerable specimen of that part of speech, and say—a stamen: the adoption, or crea-

tion of a new compound term, however, to signify this, was a useless measure, for it already formed the literal analogue of the original Latin, *Stamen*. Then, how was the term *Monandria*, if meant to pass for a noun and to be translated, a stamen, to convey the idea of a class of plants having only one stamen, but in each flower? It would be absurd to speak of the class *Stamen*, but not a whit more so than of the class *Monandria*, if held to be a noun feminine, because, in the only suitable interpretation which by more than justifiable straining could be given to it under this aspect, it signifies, *a* stamen. Translate it in any other way, and you constitute an adjective and substantive agreeing with each other.

Diandria and *Triandria* are more conspicuously illustrative of this point, and it is difficult to conceive how any one of such compound terms could, with the least regard to correctness, have been considered, far more, have been put forth in works for instructing the unlearned, as a noun feminine. *Triandria*, ($\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$, three, and $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$), is not, cannot be, the name of a thing, but forms an adjective term plainly expressing the quality of a certain word, which is the name of a thing,—a noun. It is impossible to dispose of it satisfactorily in any other manner. We might seem, indeed, to confer a merely substantive expression on the term, in this manner—a tre-stamen (for triple stamen) as we say, trefoil. But such a word, to be admissible into language at all, must be held to indicate a single, particular object, like the trefoil, which, although it presents the semblance of three leaves, and hence its name, they proceed from one foliole, or leaf-stalk,—but it could not denote the class of things intended. For it is to be remarked, that *Diandria* and *Triandria* (and it is the same with all the others according to their several significations) do not refer to two, or to three stamens, united in some way or other so as to form a couplet or triplet, a two-fold or a three-fold object, but distinguish groups or collections of plants, the flowers of which are provided with two, or with three stamens, unconnected with each other and distinct from the pistil.

2. By their *application*. The titles of Classes and Orders are, for the most part, applied to genera, or kinds of plants, which closely assimilate as to the number and particular arrangement of stamens and of pistils, indicated by such titles respectively. Thus, it is conceived, were they originally employed; for thus alone can they be looked on as correct and proper terms. *Monandria*, *Diandria*, and *Triandria*, and all similar terms, are nominatives plural neuter of adjectives of the first and second declensions, ending in *-ius*, *-ia*, *-ium*. Each of them has the adjective quality, having or possessing,—and each “agrees with a substantive in gender, number, and case,” that substantive, which is not expressed but understood, being *genera*, the nominative plural of *Genus*, n. a kind or species, or of some similar word. Together, they very aptly express the kinds having one stamen, two stamens, or three stamens, of plants whose flowers are so furnished. *Monogynia*, *Digynia*, and *Trigynia*, also agreeing with *genera*, as fitly notify the same kinds, as having, or provided with one pistil, or more, as the term may express. It may be noticed, in further corroboration of this view, that writers and lecturers on Botany are in the constant habit of having recourse to English adjective terms, which are directly formed from the Latin ones, as *Monandrious*, or *Monandrous* (the presence or absence of the letter *i* being immaterial, as to most of them), *Diandrous*, and *Triandrous*, flowers or plants, or kinds of flowers or plants. It cannot be said that these have any traces of the character of nouns, yet are they literal analogues of the Latin terms in question, and are very convenient for illustrating the science of Botany to the young and the non-classically educated. And if, in spite of all propriety, the Linnæan titles were to be maintained as nouns feminine, we should have to view these English adjectives as specialties in English scientific terminology: we should have to convert *them*, therefore, into Latin again, by creating new analogues, in addition to, but the same in at least one gender, as the falsely reputed nouns from which they sprung. This were, indeed, but a clumsy expedient: and

happily it is one which is rendered wholly unnecessary by the fact, that the existing terms, in their true character of adjectives, already answer that as well as their original purpose, and that they are, in fact, the very terms of which these English analogues are simply translations.

3. By their *termination*. Holding them, for a moment, entitled to be ranked as nouns, the purpose to which they are applied, viz., that of distinguishing several series of plants into Classes and Orders, of certain character respectively, is indisputably plural. And where shall we find the termination *-ia*, in the plural of a noun feminine of the first declension? These final letters can only belong to the nominative, the accusative, and the vocative of the neuter *plural*, whether of a noun, or of an adjective.

4. By *analogy*. The terms appropriated to the classification of the Jussieuan, or Natural System of Botany, exclusive of such as are adopted from the Linnæan system, are also adjective, agreeing with *Genera*, *Familie*, *Species*, or *Tribus*, excepting some simple names of plants, as *Fungi*, *Algæ*, *Filices*, *Lichenes*, &c. Occasionally, too, a Linnæan term itself is set aside by other Botanists, who put in its place a term beyond all doubt adjective, as, for instance, the Class *Cryptogamia* of Linnæus, is, by Richard, entitled *Inembryonata*, *Exembryonata*, or *Ahrizæ*; by Decandolle, *Cellulares*; and by Lamarck, *Agamiæ*. In a recent work, this very term, *Cryptogamia*, is, in perfect consistency with the opinion here advanced, translated "Cryptogamic, or flowerless plants," a translation which never could have been extracted out of a noun, or simple name of a Class. Further, be it observed, (and this also bears reference to the third ground stated in justification,) that all these titles, both adjective and simple nouns, are invariably placed in the nominative plural, a fact quite subversive of the belief that those more immediately under remark are nouns feminine; for, if so, then their nominatives

plural could never end either in *a*, or in *ia*, the terminations, one or other of which all of them bear.

The opportunities of research available to a private individual, confined by his professional avocations to a provincial town, must necessarily be limited; and they have not enabled me to trace out any authority for ranking these terms as nouns feminine, except in several editions of the Work from which the example presented is taken. In other works of a like nature, they merely appear as they did when employed by Linnæus himself. Here, again, however, exception must be made of some, of French authorship, in which not only a noun (“*Cryptogamie*. s. f.”*) is in each instance created as the analogue of the term applied to a Class, but also, the addition of another term both adjective and substantive (“*Cryptogame*. Adj. et. s. f.”†) is had recourse to. This mode of patching up difficulties may have been deemed requisite in that language, from its deficiency, like our own, in those distinctive terminations with which the Latin is so well supplied. Or, is it too much to assume, that such authorities may have been misled by the final letter of the terms in question, and by the circumstance that each appears solitarily, and is employed familiarly, as *the name* of a Class, or of an Order, and so may have decided that they were to be considered nouns feminine of the first declension?‡

It has been shown, then, how inconsistent and irreconcilable is the character of a noun feminine with the *meaning*, *application*, and *termination* of these terms, and with *analogy*. All such inconsistency, however, is entirely removed by regarding them as having an adjective quality, which, I am convinced, is their strictly correct and legitimate arrangement. Their translation, therefore, will be, having, consisting of, or provided with one, two, three, or more stamens, as the case may be; or, more tersely, the *one-stamened*, *two-stamened*, or *three-*

* Jourdan.

† Ibid.

‡ See Note * on page 20.

stamened kinds, and so of all the rest. Some may be ready to say, it is probably true that these words are not correctly characterised, but still, they have been long in use as they are, and seem to have answered the purpose intended by their invention well enough. Without offering a word condemnatory of such complacent utilitarianism, I put it to all concerned, whether, on the score of convenience, independently of all considerations of correctness, their character as adjective terms be not preferable to that hitherto assigned them.

SECTION VI.

OF THE *SPIRITUS ASPER*, OR ASPIRATE ' OF THE GREEK, AND THE MISPLACEMENT OF ITS SYMBOL, THE LETTER *H*, IN LATIN COMPOUND TERMS, AND IN THEIR ENGLISH ANALOGUES.

IT has appeared remarkable, that in almost all (I say, almost all, for there are exceptions,) Latin compound terms derived from the Greek and their English analogues, in which the *Spiritus asper* of that language, or rather, what is its equivalent symbol, the letter *h*, has been preserved, it is removed from the situation it held in the etymon of the derivative, and is put into another, where, literally, it has no business, but is superfluous and useless. Without labouring to perpetrate a witticism, I may be said to enter upon delicate ground, when venturing to find fault with any little mal-appropriation of this one while favoured, at another, slighted and despised symbol, to which, indeed, the honour of being considered a letter at all, has been denied.* It forms no part of my intention, however, to carp at a single instance of those friendly liberties taken with the *h* in certain considerable districts of England. My remarks are to be confined to its misplacement in Scientific Nomenclature.

The examples of this misplacement in Latin and English terms are very numerous, and occur in two forms, viz., first, in the middle, or at the end of a word, as *Hæmorrhagia*, hemor-

* Priscianus, a learned Grammarian of the sixth century, cast it out from the body of letters altogether, styling it a mere mark of aspiration, and declaring it to have nothing save the figure of a letter, which was not sufficient to constitute it one, because in that case the figures of numerals would also fall to be reckoned letters.

rhage, *Catarrhus*, eatarrh, &c.: and secondly, at the beginning, as *Rhachialgia*, rhachialgy; *Rheumatismus*, rheumatism, &c. There is a great number of each kind now extant, and they are every now and then acquiring additions. The four words and their analogues, above given, are sufficient to serve the purpose of exhibiting the presumed error, which is now to be explained. The first example, under the first form of misplacement, is the word *Catarrhus*, being the medical term for the affection catarrh, or common cold, and the Latin analogue of Κατάρρεος, or, by contraction of the double *omikron* in the last two syllables, Κατάρρες, from κατὰ, downward, and ῥεος, or, by contraction ῥε, a flowing; in reference to the increased flow of the mucous discharge of the nose, which forms the most familiar symptom of this complaint. To give proper effect to the *Spiritus asper* as it occurs in this word, and thereby more clearly express my meaning, let the Greek characters forming the original term be represented, letter by letter, in Italic type, and let the symbol *h* be substituted for the aspirate, as is always done, where the force of the latter is meant to be preserved,—they will then appear in this order, *katarrhous*, and not *katarrhous*. The ordinary pronunciation of the former of these, by a person ignorant altogether of the peculiarities of the Greek characters, will be perfectly that of the same word in the original language. But such will not be the case, if the latter disposition of the *h*, which is that hitherto adopted in the Latin and English analogues of terms of this kind, be given effect to. It is plain, then, that the *h*, as representing the aspirate in the Greek term, must be placed *between* the two *rs* in its Latin and English analogues; for surely the orthography of the derivative ought, on every principle which can guide to a correct definition and right use of words, to be maintained, (as far as may be practicable), in strict conformity with that of its etymon. Why, or for what end, has the *h* been transposed from its true situation *before* the second *r*, to a place *after* it? Does not the arrangement, *Catarhrus*, catarhr, look as well and sound as agreeably, as the common but false spelling, *Catarrhus*,

catarrh; while the former has the advantage of consistency with the derivation—of being what the latter really is not, etymologically correct?

It may be answered, that, although the spelling of such words be really at variance with that of their originals, or of their etyma, yet we have been so long accustomed to use it and see it used, that it is needless now to seek a change of what serves the purpose required. Such slovenly reasoning is opposed to all improvement whatever. But an incorrect orthography of terms does *not* serve the purpose required; for, inserted as they are in all kinds of Dictionaries, they present (to those at least whose education has not been confined to mere “reading, writing, and arithmetic”), a disagreeable discrepancy between them and their origin. Thus, to take the next term, *Hæmorrhagia*, a word borrowed, literatim, from the Greek, (Αἱμορῆγία, which, rendered into Italic, is *Haimorrhagia*, an eruption of blood), the change of αἱ, or *ai* into the diphthong *æ* being scarcely an exception, bears a conspicuous departure from accuracy, presents an orthographical assertion, as it were, that is contrary to truth, in the transposition of the letter *h* from its proper situation.

It may be said, too, that the *h* being mute in these terms, it can make little difference where its orthographical position may be. In reply,—it cannot be pretended that the aspirate is without effect in the Greek analogues, or in their roots; on the contrary, it forms a perceptible element in the sound of both the etyma from which the last mentioned term is formed, namely, αἷμα *haima*, blood, and ῥῆγνυμι *hrēgnumi*, to burst. Therefore, its symbol ought not to be suppressed in the derivative; yet, if indeed mute in the latter, which in its present improper position it is, or certainly ought to be, then, better to cast it out altogether as a useless incumbrance (which in several similarly derived terms, to be presently noticed, has actually been done), than maintain, without excuse, an error which appears to have had no higher origin than the carelessness, or the fancy, of a transcriber.

The first example under the second form, or of the misplacement of *h*, near the beginning of a Greek derivative, is *Rhachialgia*, from ῥάχις *hrachis*, the spine, and ἄλγος *algos*, pain. In this, as in words of like construction as to their first syllables, the symbol of the aspirate is out of place, its presence where it is usually inserted being quite unnecessary, either for sound or distinction's sake, and, therefore, its entire dismissal would be preferable to this its faulty disposal. Nor would the adoption of this course be without ample precedent, the expedient of throwing it out having been adopted in numerous instances of precisely similar derivation, so far as the *Spiritus asper* is concerned, as *Rupia*, from ῥῦπος *hrupos*, sordes; *Ruta*, from ῥύομαι *hruomai*, to liberate; *Raphanus*, from ῥάφανος παρὰ τὸ ῥαδίως φαίνεσθαι *hraphanos para to hradiōs phainesthai*, because it grows easily, or quickly; *Raphe*, from ῥαφή *hraphē*, a suture; *Racosis*, from ῥάκος *hrakos*, a rag, &c. The second example given of this form, *Rheumatismus*, is subject to the same remarks in every respect.

These two sets of terms, which are strictly analogous in regard to their origin from roots having the aspirated P *R* or *rho*, for their initial letter, but different from each other, as to the retention in the one, and the exclusion from the other, of the symbol *h*, prove, most effectually, with how little pretension to authority, or adherence to uniformity, the aspirate has hitherto been dealt with; how accidentally and arbitrarily it has been misplaced. If it is held to be useless in *Rupia*, *Raphanus*, *Raphe*, and *Racosis*, of what greater use can its perpetuation be, out of its true position as it is, in *Rhachialgia*, *Rheumatismus*, &c.? Since the symbol of the aspirate has, in many instances and without the slightest detriment been omitted, what just grounds can be advanced for encumbering others with it, seeing that it lends nothing whatever to the sound, nor any thing to the sense, and far from being a distinguishing mark (placed where it usually is) of their true derivation, is a positive perversion of what appears in the respective etyma from which they are drawn?

Such is a brief sketch of the nature of the misplacement of the *h*, as the symbolic representative of the *Spiritus asper*, or aspirate, in Latin terms derived from the Greek and their analogues,—and of the more superficial of the reasons which may be brought forward in its defence. I am sensible, and take the opportunity of confessing this, that many will be ready to contemplate with a smile of something between complacency and derision,—the seriousness with which my labours, under this Section more particularly, have been prosecuted. I would respectfully press on the attention of those so disposed, a consideration of the general reasons for the course taken, embodied in the Introduction, and I now present to their notice, one of a special kind, applicable to my own circumstances in reference to the discrepancy already pointed out,* between the situation of the aspirate in the etymon and of its symbol *h* in the derivative, viz., that as in arranging the Work now in preparation, hundreds of these discrepancies exhibited themselves, a minute and careful examination of the subject seemed to be called for.

Arguments of an apparently stronger kind have been adduced on the same side, by men on whose judgment in all matters one would be disposed to place implicit reliance. In the course of these, it has been asked of me, “Why say that *h* should be *before* the *r*, when in the Greek characters it (the aspirate) is *over* the letter, and all classical writers put the *h* after the *r*?” and this question may be said to comprehend all of objection that can be stated against the views here promulgated. The first part, namely, why the *h* should be placed before the *r*, is most important; but the statement of its being *over* the letter, by which it is accompanied, shows a misapprehension of a very trivial circumstance,—while the latter portion, asserting that all classical writers put the *h* after the *r*, if strictly true, would only corroborate my allegation, of the prevalence of the error under consideration. I will now endeavour to show the nature and origin of the *Spiritus*, both *asper* and

* See page 49, the ninth to the fourteenth line.

lenis, and then try to give a distinct reply to each of these three branches of objection.

The Greek letter H was not originally employed in the manner it now is, as the larger sign or capital of the long ε, or η *eta*. It was drawn from the Hebrew radical ה or Heth, and formerly was the mark of aspiration, as stated in these words,—Οἶμαι δὲ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἥ σοιχείας τυπώσασθαι τὰς παλαιὰς τὴν δασεῖαν· διόπερ καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι πρὸ πάντων τῶν δασυνομένων ὀνομάτων τὸ ἥ προγράφουσι,*—“I consider the ancients to have formed (expressed) aspiration by the letter H: wherefore the Romans also wrote η *before all aspirated words*.” In a similar manner, among the marks or signs of numbers which were anciently employed by the Greeks, H signified a hundred, because it was *the first letter* of the aspirated word now written ἑκατὸν (*hekaton*), being the Greek synonyme for the Latin numeral adjective, *centum*. To establish this point beyond doubt, the additional fact may be stated, that they then actually wrote and carved on tablets and monuments the numeral adjective referred to, thus, Ηεκατὸν, placing the H, or element of aspiration,—in a word, the aspirate,—as its *first letter*, and so, indisputably, *before* the present aspirated initial ε of ἑκατὸν. It is at the same time to be noticed, that they afterwards made use of the letter H for ε long, as is expressly stated by Plato in his *Cratylus*,† in these words, εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἐχρῶμεθα ἀλλὰ εἰ τὸ παλαιόν, “for we did not formerly use η but ε.”

But further,—There is another fact, and one of curious interest; the *Spiritus*, both *asper* and *lenis*, which are now represented in this form, ‘, and ’, are but modifications of the equal halves of the letter H itself, divided lengthways. They have been thus modified, no doubt, for the sake of simplicity or convenience; but that such was their origin is very clearly demonstrable. The Greeks, as we have seen, did not anciently place H (as the element of aspiration) above, but ingrafted it on and *at the beginning* of the line, word, or letter aspirated; and hence there arose much error, it is said, from their having

* Athenæus, ix., § 57, p. 398 a.

† § 91, p. 426 c.

begun to employ the same letter H, for long ε or η.* In consequence of which they for a time placed it above, and, at length, they divided it into two, that by this means the first or anterior part might signify the mark of aspiration, or the aspirate (*Spiritus asper*),—and the posterior, the gentle or non-aspirated mark (*Spiritus lenis*); in which manner they are still to be found employed in ancient writings. Again, on some very ancient coins of the Hcracleënses, or people of Heraclea, there may be accordingly read ΙΗΡΑΚΛΕΩΝ, and ΙΗΡΑΚΛΕΤΩΝ, the aspirate, in this its half-modified state, being placed *before* the H, which was by that time made to signify the long ε or η, of the context.

Evidence to the same effect is afforded by another author† in these words “Hanc aspirandi vim ei nativam et genuinam fuisse ipsa ejus arguit origo ex Heb. ה, quam originem inquam, et nomen et ordo et figura comprobant. . . . Primitus igitur η aspirabat, ascripta vocalibus extrinsecus, tribus autem mutis, quas dixi π ς τ, intrinsecus; at postquam vocalis esse cœperat, ex majusculâ H divisâ effecti sunt duo *spiritus*; quippe dextra pars *lenem*, *asperum* sinistra indicabat: nam antea lenis ex absentia alterius intelligebatur.” Thus Englished, “Its (the aspirate’s) very origin from the Hebrew ה, argues this power of aspirating to have been native and proper to it, which origin, I maintain, its name, rank, and figure unite to prove. . . . At first, therefore, η served to aspirate, being applied to vowels on the *outside*, but to the three mutes before stated π ς τ, on the *inside*; but after it began to be reckoned a vowel, two *Spiritus* were supplied from the larger H being divided; that is to say, the right half indicated the *lenis*, the *left* the *asper*: for formerly the *lenis* was understood, by the absence of the other.”

Such is the nature and origin of the aspirate. I now proceed to consider the three heads of objection comprehended in

* “De Veteri et Recta Græcæ Linguae Pronunciatione.”—*Scapula*.

† Littleton.

the question which has been asked;—and *first*, Why the *h* should be placed before the *r*. It distinctly appears from what has been already brought forward, that the *Spiritus asper* was placed by the Greeks themselves “*before*” and *not after* “*all aspirated words*” or letters. Accordingly, in Greek grammar, the rudimentary instructions contain the following, or similarly expressed Rules;—1. Every word commencing with a vowel, or diphthong, “*Spiritum, tenuem, vel asperum accipit in principio*” takes the soft breath, or the rough, (that is, the aspirate,) in or *at the beginning*. 2. All words beginning with *υ* or *ξ* are aspirated, as ὕδωρ *hudōr*, water, ῥῆμα *hrēma*, a word; but if *ξ* be doubled in the middle of a word, the first is softened, the other aspirated, as ἔγγωσο *erhrōso*, farewell. Let it be particularly marked, that the latter of these Rules makes no exception or distinction as to *ξ* at the beginning of a word being to be treated differently from *υ* in the same situation and already by the previous Rule said to take the soft breath, or the rough, *at the beginning*, but declares that “*υ* and *ξ*,” both, of course, equally and precisely in the same manner, “*are aspirated*;” and with what vestige of reason can you place *h after r*, in the face of this Rule, while you strictly obey it, by placing *h before υ* or its representative, *y*, in all words, or derivatives of words, beginning with the latter?

I most willingly lay before my readers the only shadow of authority for employing the *h after r* which I have met with. It occurs in the following sentence, which is a continuation of the passage already quoted. “*Latinum h vocalibus quibusvis præponitur, ut hamus, herus, hio, homo, humus, hyems; subjicitur autem tribus mutis p c t, et semivoc. r; idque duntaxat in Gr. vocibus, ut Philippus, Chremes, Thraso, Pyrrhus.*” “The Latin *h* is placed before every vowel, as *hamus*, &c., but it is put after the three mutes *p c t*, and the semi-vowel *r*; and that only in Greek words, as *Philippus*, *Pyrrhus*,” &c. This quotation, at first thought, might seem to give some sort of sanction to placing *h* after the *r*, and I have presented it in all fairness, purposely, to qualify my own views, if

it shall be thought to have power to do so. Be it remembered, however, that it is the Latin *h*, and not the Greek aspirate, which is here spoken of; that any misuse of the former cannot set aside the Rules which are enjoined for dealing with the latter, any more than a blundering provincialism can supersede the correctness of pure language; and that, in such misuse, unauthorised as it is by any such Rules, consists the very misplacement of which I complain. These observations are, I conceive, borne out by the immediate context of the passage last quoted. “Sanè antiquos nusquam nisi in vocali aspiratione usos affirmat Cic. quare *Purrum* semper Ennius non *Pyrrhum* dixit, et *Fruges* pro *Phryges*.” “Cicero truly affirms that anciently it (*h*) was *never* used but in the aspiration of vowels: wherefore Ennius has always said *Purrum*, not *Pyrrhum*, and *Fruges* for *Phryges*.” And by this is the idea of sanction, seemingly implied in the previous quotation, quite destroyed.

But once more; this author elsewhere writes on the same point of the Latin *h*, as follows;—“Aspiratio ista an præmitti, an postponi deberet, meritò quæri potest. Hoc ex usu obtinuit, ut ῥέδα *rheda*, &c., illud ratio suadet, undè pro ῥόδον Æoles dixêre βῥόδον, β loco spiritus (sive, quod vult Priscianus, digamma) posito. Sanè vetustiores ex barbaris (Gothos et Teutonas loquor) *h* ante *l*, *n* et *r* locaverunt.” “Whether this aspiration ought to be put before, or placed after, is deserving of enquiry. The latter has obtained by custom, as ῥέδα *rheda*, &c., but *reason counsels the former*, whence the Æolians have said βῥόδον for ῥόδον, β being put in the place of the *Spiritus*, (or, as Priscianus considers, the digamma). Certainly, the more ancient of the barbarians* (I allude to the Goths and Teutons) *have placed h before l, n and r*.” The numerous facts which have now been brought forward would appear to be decisive of this, the first part of the question under consideration; but some stress has been laid by my respected opponents in opinion, on the circumstance of the aspirate appearing, in

* “Barbari dicebantur antiquitus omnes gentes, exceptis Græcis.”—*Festus*.

the Greek characters, to be placed *over* the letter aspirated, as proving that it was not intended to be placed *before* that letter.

We thus come to consider the *second* portion of the question, being the statement that the aspirate is placed *over* the letter, urged as a reason for holding that it ought not to be *before* it. The fact is admitted to be as stated, in what printers call the lower-case letters; its position in regard to capital letters, however, is never *over*, but in many works is (improperly, as has been shown), *after* the letter, while in numbers of others it occupies its right place, *before* it. And what is the simple deduction to be drawn? Why, just that it is placed over the lower-case letter, for mere typographical convenience, the aspirate and letter in each example of their joint occurrence forming a single type, but in the capitals this is impracticable, because the face of the letter occupies the entire end-surface of the type, leaving no room for introducing the *Spiritus*, either *asper* or *lenis*. The aspirate for such letters, therefore, has to be used as a separate type; the order of its location is at the mercy of the compositor, who is not always a Greek scholar,—finds no very distinct direction in the manuscript,—and has equal precedents before him for persevering in the error, or adopting what is correct. But even if the aspirate had been *over* the capital letters, as well as above those which are called the lower-case or small, this could not have furnished proof that its situation ought to be *after*, any more than *before* the letter, but must have left the point of its location exactly where it stood.

The *third* head of the interrogatory comprises the objection, of all classical writers having put the *h* *after* the *r*. That not only all classical writers, but all of the scientific, philosophical, professional, non-professional, learned, and unlearned—that, in short, every one commits the alleged error of putting the *h* *after* the *r*, instead of before it, is true, constituting the very ground of all my remarks on the subject. *Hinc illæ lachrymæ!* Unless, however, this long-continued and universal

indulgence in what I conceive to be a palpable misplacement of the *h* can confer a prescriptive right to its continuance *in perpetuum*, there exists not one fair and substantial plea for its retention.

Having established, satisfactorily, I trust, that the true position of the letter *h*, as the symbol of the aspirate in Latin terms derived from the Greek, and in their English analogues, is *before* and not *after* the aspirated letter, it necessarily follows, that the allegation of its misplacement, as it now stands in those terms and analogues, has also been fully substantiated. The circumstance, that where in Greek words the aspirate precedes an initial vowel or diphthong, it is invariably represented in the same situation by the letter *h* in their Latin derivatives, as in those of Αἷμα *Haima*, viz., *hæmorrhagia*, *hemorrhage*; of ὕδρωψ *Hudrōps*, that is, *Hydrops*, dropsy, &c., serves to show, not only the impropriety of having suppressed the symbol of the aspirate before the initial consonant *R*, but also the inconsistency of pretending to retain it by absurdly putting it in a place where it is unmeaningly in the way, and often, (to some fingers at least,) a hinderance to ready writing, as in *Rhachitis*, *Rhachialgia*, *Rhizophora*, *Rhonchus*, &c. In any other situation than before the initial letter, it is sometimes excluded, as in *Hydrorachis* (ὕδωρ *Hudōr*, water; ῥάχις *hrachis*, the spine,) instead of *Hydrorhachis*, as it should have been, according to the faulty custom hitherto adopted; sometimes correctly included, as in *Ahrizus*, (ἄ, privative, and ῥίζα *hriza*, a root,) but far more frequently it is egregiously misplaced, as in the terms just stated and referred to in the earlier portion of this Section.

The conspicuous want of uniformity, to say no more, in a matter of constant recurrence, is calculated to shed no great lustre upon the lovers of wisdom, who, striving with their whole heart and mind to attain to heights of knowledge which perhaps the Omniscient willed should never be reached by mortals, are yet content to practise what many an unlucky urchin

has been chastised for,—a manifest blunder in spelling; for it is obvious, that of the three modes existing, *h* before the *r* as in *Ahrizus*, after it as in *Rhachitis*, and thrown out altogether, as in *Raphe*, only one can be right. The English analogues of most of the terms in which the misplacement of the *h* occurs, are inserted in our Dictionaries, but this forms no good reason for keeping up their erroneous construction, neither any insuperable obstacle to their being altered.

It is humbly proposed, then, as a necessary correction of error, that in all Latin terms and their English analogues, derived from the Greek, in which the aspirate occurs elsewhere than in the beginning, it be given effect to, as a distinguishing feature of their origin, by inserting its symbol in the same place it occupies in the etymon or root,—namely, before the aspirated letter:—That where the aspirate, prefixed as it always is to the initial P or *rho*, would require its symbol *h* to precede the corresponding initial R of Latin terms derived from the Greek and their English analogues,—the *h* may well be dispensed with altogether; because, 1. Its being prefixed now, in its proper place, would occasion a change in the alphabetical arrangement of such terms; 2. Its retention in only a few instances, in a situation where it does not constitute any part of their sound, nor any special mark of their derivation, presents an unwarrantable departure from the orthography and orthoëpy of their etyma; and, 3. The omission suggested has already been made in many terms which are of a precisely similar origin.

DIVISION II.,

COMPRISING

TERMS PECULIAR TO THE NOMENCLATURE OF MEDICAL
SCIENCE.

SECTION I.

OF THE PATHOLOGICAL TERM *ANASARCA*.

IN thus singling out a particular term as the subject of a Section, as is repeatedly done under this Division, I beg not to be misconceived. This, or any other solitary instance, it is true, might be quietly passed over, whether correct or not, without much detriment to science, or its nomenclature. But as a group, they are considerable in number, and, it is hoped that the reasoning employed in the illustration and for the improvement of each, will yield some light by which to be guided in rectifying such as may not be specially brought forward here, or in constructing new words.

This word, long current in Medical language, has recently been brought into more special notice by the promulgation of a dictum of Kühn's, to the effect that it has hitherto been mistaken for a noun of the first declension, whereas it is really indeclinable. In support of his assertion he has pleaded, that *σάρκα* is the accusative case of *σάξ* and governed by the preposition *ἀνά*, which is joined only to that case. With all respect for such an authority, I cannot help considering, that the premises do not at all warrant the conclusion at which he has arrived.

True it is, that *σάρκα* is the accusative case of *σάξ*; true, also, that the rule declares the preposition *ἀνὰ* is joined only to an accusative; and, therefore, it is unquestionable, that, if this preposition were to be introduced into a sentence of the Greek language, in reference to the noun *σάξ*, the latter must, in all propriety, be placed in the accusative case, which case is *σάρκα*.

But this can place no restriction on the formation of a Latin compound term, nor can it form any valid objection to the constituting of such term a noun of the first declension. It proves nothing more than a mere coincidence,—the existence of a similarity of orthography and sound between that case of the Greek noun *σάξ*, viz., *σάρκα*, and the latter half of the nominative of the Latin term, viz., *-sarca*, a circumstance which involves no necessity for declaring it to be indeclinable. In truth, the alleged mistake must have been of considerable standing, for the word has been in general use among the members of the medical profession, and is one of the few medical terms to be found in Latin Classical Dictionaries,* where it is distinctly characterised as a noun of the first declension. *Anasarca* is simply a term compounded from two Greek words, to which, in order that it might be properly adopted into the Latin, like an infinite number of others, that grammatical condition has been originally assigned, for convenience, in medical language, but without any marked reference to *ἀνὰ* being a preposition, or to the fact that, as such, the Greek rule joins it only to an accusative, that case of *σάξ* being *σάρκα*.

I submit, that the construction of a Latin compound term should not be cramped by close adherence to a rule of grammar of a different language. As well might it be assumed that *Moxa* had been “mistaken” for a noun of the first declension, because it is a Japanese word; or *Myrrha*, for that it is a Hebrew one, each unvarying in its termination in the language it belongs to; and that therefore both are really indeclinable.

* Gouldman's, Littleton's, &c.

It is needless to multiply examples; those presented may suffice to show, that the alteration proposed is uncalled for, and that the opinion expressed is unsound; an opinion which, if energetically acted on, would most inconveniently narrow the resources of scientific nomenclature. It is held, then, that *Anasarca* is properly characterised as a noun of the first declension, its grammatical position, as a Latin noun, standing unaffected by the circumstance of ἀνὰ being a preposition, or σάρκα being the accusative of σάρξ, or by the Greek rule which joins the former only to that case.

SECTION II.

OF THE ANATOMICAL TERM *GASTROCNEMIUS*.

THIS word is presented in the Medical Dictionary as a noun masculine:—thus,

“*GASTROCNEMIUS*. (*us*, *i*. m.; from *γαστήρ*, the stomach, and *κνήμη*, the leg.) Two, or according to some anatomists, four muscles form the fleshy part, or calf of the leg. These muscles are called *gastrocnemii*.”*

Such, however, seems to me to be neither the true grammatical rank, nor the direct or immediate derivation of the term; nor does it in itself even mean the calf of the leg; or, if so, then the name by which “these muscles are called” is evidently erroneous.

Classical and medical authorities† present two nouns, of similar construction with this term and synonymous with each other; the one, *Gastrocnemia*, of the first declension, the other *Gastrocnemion*, of the second. Both are adopted, *literatim*, from the Greek, and each signifies *the calf of the leg*, but nowhere, in my experience, is to be found any mention of this supposed noun *gastrocnemius*. One of the older anatomists, indeed, has employed in his writings the expression *Musculi gastrocnemii*,‡ and so, has given rise, perhaps, to the idea of the character of the latter of these two words, as if it were the nominative plural of a noun, *gastrocnemius*, the name of a muscle. It cannot satisfactorily be so characterised, nor does the expression itself absolutely demand that it should. Its translation cannot be, as seems to have been supposed, the muscles, the *gastrocnemii*,—as we might say, the men, the Thompsons,—for where can we get such a nominative plural

* Hooper.

† Gouldman, Castellus.

‡ Barthol. Anat., lib. iv., c. 13.

out of the only two nouns then, or now in existence, viz., *gastrocnemia* and *gastrocnemion*,—but, with equal propriety and convenience, it might be translated, the muscles of the calf of the leg,—*gastrocnemii* being held to be the genitive of *gastrocnemion*, because the only case in which such a termination was to be found.

It was unnecessary, therefore, to assume the existence of a noun masculine, *gastrocnemius*, as the special name of a muscle, or muscles; because this word, if it did exist, or was to have existence at all, could only be viewed as a very superfluous synonyme of the other two, *gastrocnemia* and *gastrocnemion*, signifying not a muscle nor even the quality of a muscle, but simply, like them, *the calf of the leg*. But to invent an adjective term, of the same termination as the pretended noun and on the model of these two classical synonyms, which should bear *relation* or allusion to the *calf of the leg*, and signify, pertaining, belonging to, or connected with that part, was quite consistent with established precedent. Agreeably to the view taken, the expression *musculi gastrocnemii* would *now* be perfectly intelligible as the concord of an adjective with a substantive, signifying the muscles belonging to, or forming, the calf of the leg; but it could not have borne this interpretation *then*, because no such adjective was in existence, neither a noun masculine, nor any other substantive than *gastrocnemia* and *gastrocnemion*. The reasonableness of this will be rendered much more conspicuous by our adopting into the English language, by a very common expedient, a single word, fashioned in the same form as the invented Latin term (except only in the terminating syllable) and expressing the same meaning, viz., *gastrocnemian*. Such an expedient is both serviceable and allowable; both terms, Latin and English, being applicable not only to the two, or four muscles, but to every other part entering into the formation of the calf of the leg,—to the skin, cellular tissue, fascia, vessels, and nerves, composing, supplying, or traversing its region, and to the region itself.

Gastrocnemius, bears the same relation to *gastrocnemion* as, it was formerly attempted to be shown,† *Arytanoideus* (*musculus*) did to *Arytenoides* (*cartilagineus*.) It stands precisely in the same position as the numerous adjectives ending in *-us*, *-eus*, or *-is*, which are by habit similarly applied to muscles as names, though in reality they are only terms indicative of their form, or situation, the word *musculus* being always understood, and most of them having at the same time a general application. In corroboration, it may be stated, that the same muscle, or muscles, to which *gastrocnemius* is applied, is, or are, distinguished by the adjective term *gemellus* (*musculus*) or the double muscle.

The term *Gastrocnemius*, therefore, hitherto represented and treated as a noun masculine, will be more correct, more consistent with analogy, and much more convenient, if held to be an adjective,—meaning, having relation to, or connection with, the calf of the leg, and must be applied to some object indicated by a noun expressed or understood, and placed in agreement with it. For although it be common enough to make use of an adjective substantively,† and so, to speak and write without scruple of the *gastrocnemius*, or of the *gastrocnemii*, by which will be readily understood the well known muscles of the calf of the leg, still, this is done only by virtue of a liberty taken with correct language, which can never constitute an authority for setting forth this word in Dictionaries as other than an adjective term.

* See Div. I., Sect. ii., page 26.

† See Note at foot of page 20.

SECTION III.

OF THE ANATOMICAL TERM *PSALLOIDES*.

THIS word, as one of the numerous class ending in *-ides*, falls of course under the remarks contained in Div. I., Sect. i. But it is brought forward in this place for reasons different from that of its terminal syllables, or of its adjective character. It is familiarly known, from its entering into the distinctive epithet *Corpus psalloides*, given by anatomists to the triangular medullary space between the posterior crura of the *Fornix cerebri*, because its inferior surface is marked with prominent medullary fibres which have suggested the likeness to a stringed musical instrument. It would no doubt be correct enough in itself, like any other of the multitude of terms of recent invention resembling it, provided its etymology were unexceptionable; and it would have been correctly enough applied in the instance referred to, if that epithet were really meant to be employed differently from, and in addition to, one previously existing; viz., *Corpus psaloides*. The only objection to its introduction would be, the confusion which must arise in the attempt to discriminate between two epithets so like in their construction, and applied to objects which are so closely related to each other.

The first-mentioned of these epithets, or *Corpus psalloides*, indicates the medullary space already described; while the other, or *Corpus psaloides*, denotes, not that space, which constitutes only a part of the under surface, posteriorly, of the Fornix, but the Fornix itself, or, as the words signify, the arched body. That the former never was meant to be so employed, however, but is only a corruption of the latter, or original term, and therefore, that it is mis-spelt, its etymology is mis-stated, and in its application to the appearance as of

strings of a musical instrument on the inferior and posterior surface of the Fornix, it is mis-used, appears certain from the circumstance that no other term of like orthography is to be found in anatomical language. There is a synonyme for the object to which the epithet *Corpus psalloides* has been applied, viz., *Lyra*, to which no objection can be offered. It is the error of substituting that corrupted epithet for the true and legitimate one of *Corpus psaloides*, and of thereby making it a synonyme of the *Lyra*, which it was never intended to be, that calls for reprobation and correction.

To prove the justness of these remarks, I will now quote the definition usually given of the term *psalloides*, and then attempt to show wherein the error lies.

“PSALLOIDES. (From ψαλλος, a stringed instrument, and εἶδος a likeness.) An appearance on the under surface of the fornix of the brain is called *corpus psalloides*.”*

There is no such term to be found in the older medical writers, nor in any of the Greek Lexicons, classical or medical, within my reach; nor have I been able to trace such a word as ψαλλος, here put as its etymon, any where. Instead, however, appears *Psaloides*,† the analogue of ψαλοειδής for ψαλιδοειδής,‡ signifying, arched like a vault, and applied to a *hard body borne or raised on three arches forming the roof of the third or middle ventricle of the brain*. It thus ought, strictly, to be *Psalidoides*, being derived from ψαλλίς, ἴδος. ἡ, an arched work, and εἶδος, resemblance; and it means,—like or resembling an arched work, arch, or vault. The *Corpus psaloides*, therefore, (adopting the contracted form of this word,) cannot be a synonyme of *Lyra*, which is the correct name for the appearance of cords or lines, on the under surface, posteriorly, of the *Fornix*, but is another term for the *Fornix* itself, viz., the arch-like, or arched body.

Psalloides appears to have been corrupted from *Psaloides*; and although it would have been good in itself, if really derived from such a word as ψαλλος, and applied to any object

* Hooper.

† Castellus.

‡ Gorræus.

having the resemblance which its quality would then have denoted; yet, as no such etymon exists, it is a false term,—and even were it the reverse, it would be erroneously used in the epithet *Corpus psalloides*.

We thus see that it is incorrect in its orthography, in the etymology assigned to it, and in its application as a synonyme of the term *Lyra*: indeed, it seems an absurdity to think of applying the term *corpus*, or body, to the mere small *space* or posterior portion of the under-surface of the *Fornix*, which, however, is appropriately named *Lyra*. There is no difficulty in imagining how error may have arisen in the first two particulars, and how easily and naturally these would lead to its commission in the third, and also to the confounding of the *Fornix* with the *Lyra*, by anatomists, who teach as they were taught, without a care whether the epithet *Corpus psalloides* be correct or not,—without a thought as to its being properly applied, or the contrary. Consistently with these remarks, it is proposed to restore to this term its true orthography, etymology, meaning, and application; viz., *Psaloïdes*. Adj., (Ψαλῖς, an arch, or vault; ἔδος, resemblance.) Resembling an arch or vault, and so applied to the body otherwise termed the *Fornix*.

SECTION IV.

OF THE PATHOLOGICAL TERMS *EMPROSTHOTONOS*, *OPISTHOTONOS*, AND *PLEUROTHOTONOS*.

THESE three terms, hitherto presented in medical Dictionaries as nouns masculine, the names of particular forms of spasmodic affection of the muscles, are unquestionably adjective in their character, requiring to be joined to nouns expressed or understood, to which they add, severally, a distinction in some certain quality. So much has been stated and reiterated in these pages about adjective and substantive, that it may be feared the subject has become tiresome. Let it be considered, however, that, though when thus collected, these repeated remarks may be

“Like an oft-told tale that palls upon the ear,”

yet is it possible that each instance might be referred to, apart from the rest, and therefore each demanded a distinct explanation, even at the risk of being considered, as a whole, uselessly redundant.

The first, *Emprosthotonos*, is an analogue adopted, *literatim*, from the Greek adjective ἐμπροσθότονος. ὁ καὶ ἡ, formed from the adverb ἐμπροσθεν, signifying *before*, and τείνω, to *bend*, *stretch*, or *extend*; that is, bent, or stretched forwards. It may also be held to mean—pertaining, or belonging to the disease or affection ἐμπροσθοτονία, or a convulsion of parts forwards. The second, *Opisthotonos*, in like manner, is taken from the Greek ὀπισθότονος, formed from the adverb ὀπισθεν, *behind*, and the same verb τείνω, to *bend*, &c., and meaning bent, or stretched backwards. The third, *Pleurothotonos*, is of modern invention, being constructed in imitation of the other two, to

convey the idea of bending, or being bent to the side; from the adverb *πλευρόθεν*, from the side, and *τείνω*. All the three terms are closely similar in constitution and application, and, as a matter of course, must be included under the same general character.

It is fair to state, that with respect to the term *Opisthotonos*, (and also *Emprosthotonos*, but to save repetition I take only the former,) there is a peculiarity which would at first sight seem to militate against the opinion offered as to the grammatical classification of these terms. The Greek adjective *ὀπισθότονος*, is stated to be sometimes used substantively and synonymously with *ὀπισθοτονία*, or a convulsion of parts backwards. Similarly used, it is also made to signify "a person labouring under that disease;" (viz., *ὀπισθοτονία*) likewise "a cord, or fetters by which the hands are bound behind the back."* None of these is, in strict interpretation, the sense in which the term is employed in Pathological literature. There, it is used, and passes current as the name of a disease; and Hooper defines it to be "that form of tetanus in which the body is bent backwards;" in itself, however, the word bears no allusion to tetanus or any other disease, but has a general signification of bending backwards. And although, in medical parlance, it is applied to characterise, by a certain adjective quality *that* form of tetanus, as distinguished from others, still, its meaning and application are general, and by no means limited to a form of this or any other affection. Taking its first application, as a synonyme of *ὀπισθοτονία*, it is evident that the noun *νόσος*, ἡ, a disease, is to be understood, and that it is intended to be expressed in this way, the backward-bending, or backward-stretching disease. Its second application, to a person labouring under the disease *ὀπισθοτονία*, it is as evident, requires the word *ἄνθρωπος*, a man, to be understood, thus *ὀπισθότονος* (*ἄνθρωπος*) a man labouring under the disease *ὀπισθοτονία*, or, as the epithet might be more aptly rendered into English, an opisthotonic man. The other adaptations of this

* Hedericus.

term are simply modifications of the same style of idiomatic expression, by which the instrument employed to effect a backward-bending posture of the arms, or of the body, is designated by the distinctive term which makes known the posture itself, as *ὀπισθότονος* (*σχῶνος*) the backward-bending cord, or rope. The circumstance of the Greek analogue *ὀπισθότονος* being thus made to serve the same purpose as the noun *ὀπισθοτονία*, just forms an illustration of the idiom common to most languages, which has been already referred to.* Notwithstanding which, *ὀπισθότονος* may remain not one jot the less an adjective, and have no distinct existence as a substantive.

In Nosological descriptions, these three terms are introduced to characterise certain varieties of *Tetanus*, a spasmodic disease of the muscles; and it is remarkable that another variety, which it has been thought necessary to specify, is termed *Completus*, an adjective, signifying complete *Tetanus*, or spasmodic rigidity of the muscles of the body generally. This circumstance, trivial in itself, goes far to establish satisfactorily the true character of the terms under consideration, for it proves, that in any attempt to distinguish a new variety of *Tetanus*, recourse must be had to an adjective term expressive of the special quality by which that variety is to be recognised. Again, this fact reflects light upon what, with the same necessity for distinctive appellation, was originally intended by the adoption of terms similar to *completus* in quality and purpose. While it is admitted that in the instance of *ὀπισθότονος*, its being stated to be used substantively seems to afford some colour of authority for its like use in the Latin and in our own tongue, a use indeed which, by the idiom of these languages, would have been made of all the three terms in absence of any such authority, it presents no ground whatever for converting them into nouns substantive, this being a violation of the proprieties of grammatical arrangement which is quite indefensible.

* See Note at foot of page 20.

As in the Greek analogues of the first two, they are indubitably adjective, although somewhat unnecessarily declared to be used substantively, and the third, more recently formed in imitation of them, is of course the same;—as in the pathological nomenclature of the present day, each of them, like *completus*, is employed to distinguish, by the indication of a particular character, varieties in the form of the disease *Tetanus*;—as, further, none of them has, or can have, a perfect or independent substantive signification, therefore must they be maintained in the original and proper rank of their classical analogues, namely, that of adjective terms agreeing with the noun *Tetanus*.

There is another variety of *Tetanus* which, to avoid misconception, had as well be here noticed. It is named *Trismus*, or locked-jaw; and this word being really a noun masculine, it may occur to some that it constitutes a reason for characterising the former terms as nouns also. But there is a wide difference to be observed between it and them. *Trismus* is the analogue of *τρίσμος*, from *τρίζω* to gnash, and stands *per se* as the distinctive name of a spasmodic affection of the muscles of the jaw; and in Nosological arrangement, it is coupled with *Tetanus*, or spasmodic disease of the muscles generally, being, only for sake of correct generic distribution, ranked as a variety of that genus of diseases,—but having no grammatical association with it of any kind.

SECTION V.

OF THE ANATOMICAL TERM *PLATYSMA-MYOIDES*.

THIS term, familiarly known as the epithet applied to the broad muscle of the neck, occupies a false position in the nomenclature of Anatomy with reference to its spelling, derivation, and, consequently, the precise meaning attached to it and its employment in medical language. It is inserted in Hooper's Medical Dictionary as follows:—

“*PLATY'SMA-MYOIDES*. (From *πλατυς*, broad, *μυς*, a muscle, and *ειδος*, resemblance.) A thin muscle on the side of the neck and immediately under the skin,” &c.

No definition of the term itself is attempted, nor any further explanation of its etymology offered, nothing but this imperfect and abrupt notice of its application; the plain signification left to be inferred being,—resembling a broad muscle, or, it might be, broad (and) like a muscle. It need scarcely be said, that both of these are vague and unsatisfactory, affording no explicit idea of the real meaning of the term. The object to which it is applied is not only *like*, but actually constitutes, a broad muscle, which is called, for this very reason, *Latissimus (musculus) colli*, by Albinus and Douglas. By now endeavouring to show the erroneousess of the derivation assigned to it in the quotation, it is hoped that there will thus be provided the best means of arriving at the true signification of this epithet; for which end it will be necessary to consider separately its two components.

Platysma may be easily disposed of. It does *not* directly come “from *πλατυς*, broad,” although that is the root of the etymon from which it *is* immediately derived, viz., *πλατύνω*, to render full and spacious, or to dilate. It is the analogue of

πλάτυσμα, which signifies a broad sheet of linen, or of any thing similar, on which a plaster is spread; also, generally, that which is extended breadthwise; a dilatation, or an expansion. Thus, a lamina, or plate of iron, has been called πλάτυσμα σιδήρεα.* The words πλατὺς μῦς, which in the quoted example form two of the three items of the derivation there given of *Platysma-myoides*, are not really its etyma, but constitute a synonymous definition† of the epithet itself, simply signifying the broad muscle; and it would seem that the mere resemblance in sound of these two synonymes had led to the error of supposing the latter to be, in so far, the derivative of the former.

Myoides, like *Psaloides*,‡ is to be ranked, as to its grammatical status, with terms in *-ides* formerly considered.|| Like it, too, (if it were of genuine derivation,) this forms, in itself, a useful term, signifying, having resemblance to muscle, or flesh; but it is incorrectly employed in the epithet *Platysma-myoides*. It is there, in fact, confounded with another term, much like and very apt to be mistaken for it, but which is yet different in its nature. The proper word is *myodes*,§ the literal analogue of μυώδης, an adjective term signifying—pertaining to muscles, full of muscles or of flesh, fleshy. It is not derived from “μυς, a muscle, and εἶδος, resemblance,” but is simply a derivative of μῦς itself, the root εἶδος, which alone would have warranted the orthography in use, forming no part of its etymology. In the Greek, the terminal ώδης, as has been previously stated,¶ is of frequent occurrence in adjective terms derived from nouns, implying excess, fulness, or abundance, as in the present instance,—μῦς, a muscle; μυώδης, full of muscles or of flesh, fleshy. It is closely analogous to one employed in the Latin, having precisely the same power and meaning, and to which it has, no doubt, given origin *-ōsus*, as (adhering to a term strictly corresponding with the example

* Aëtius lib. ix., c. 48, in Greek MS.; as quoted by Gorræus. † Gorræus.

‡ See Div. II., Sect. iii., page 65. || See Div. I., Sect. i., page 17.

§ See Div. I., Sect. iv., page 35. ¶ See Div. I., Sect. iv., page 35.

before us) *musculus*, a muscle; *muscul-osus*, full of muscles or of flesh, fleshy, very muscular. It has even a still more apt analogous terminal syllable in English, of equal influence and in very general use, -ous, as muscle, a bundle of fleshy threads or fibres; muscul-ous, (the direct analogue of *musculosus*) of, or full of muscle or fleshy fibres, &c.

It is confidently submitted, therefore, that, while in the term *Platysma-myoides*, the hitherto assigned etymology, and the explanation, not given, but left to be guessed from it, are confused, mistaken, and deficient in meaning; in that which is proposed to be restored, (for, according to several authorities,* it is the true and original term itself,) viz., *Platysma-myodes*, the derivation and signification are clear, strictly correct, and convey a just notion of the object to which it is applied, namely the thin, broad, subcutaneous muscle, or, by literal translation, the muscular or fleshy expansion of the neck.

* Goræus, Scapula, Castellus, Hedericus, &c.

SECTION VI.

OF THE TERMS *ACIDUM*, *CAUSTICUM*, ETC.; OF THE TERM *EPHEMERA*; OF TERMS APPLIED AS DISTINCTIVE OF THE QUALITIES OF MEDICINES, *NARCOTICS*, *ANTISPASMODICS*, *TONICS*, ETC.; OF NAMES OF CHEMICAL PRINCIPLES, *FIBRINE*, *STEARINE*, *SALICINE*, ETC.; OF THE LATIN DIPHTHONG *Æ*, AND ITS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH TERMS; OF THE ANATOMICAL TERM *LAMBDOIDALIS*, ETC.; OF THE ANATOMICAL TERM *ZYGOMA*.

THE words *Acidum*, *Causticum*, and some others like them, are erroneously given in medical Dictionaries as nouns neuter, signifying "an acid," and "a caustic," &c. There were no such nouns in existence previously to the notification of them in such works, and, really, while all freedom is ceded as to the employment of such terms substantively,* in speech or in writing, it is worse than useless to multiply error, by creating pseudo-nouns under lexicographical authority, merely to please a mistaken fancy. There was, besides, no occasion for their manufacture, the terms in use and in proper form as adjectives being quite sufficient for every purpose. *Acidum* and *Causticum* are the nominatives singular neuter of adjectives of the first and second declensions, viz., *Acidus*, *a*, *um*, *Causticus*, *a*, *um*. They severally must have a noun understood in agreement, viz., *Acidum* (*corpus*, or *liquidum*,†) an acid (body, substance, or liquid.) *Causticum* (*medicamentum*) a caustic (medicament, or medicinal preparation.) No doubt they are often employed alone, as if they were nouns, whence, probably,

* See Note, page 20.

† This word, *liquidum*, apparently inconsistent with the above remarks, is really a noun, signifying water, or moisture. See Gouldman, Littleton, Ainsworth.

arose the error, but they are so, only idiomatically, one of the words just supplied, or some other such, being invariably understood. We, indeed, speak and write of an acid, a caustic, and of the lunar caustic; but, though their use in this manner is so perfectly familiarised that there seems to be nothing wrong in it, let the question arise—acid what, or caustic what?—(for each expresses not a thing, but a quality belonging to a thing,) and we at once perceive their incompleteness, and the error of representing either of them as a noun. The Greek synonyme of *Acidus* is ὀξύς; the analogue of *Causticus* is καυστικός, both of which are adjectives. Therefore, and as there is no hinderance to our employing them in colloquy or in composition, either Latin or English, substantively, so, there was no occasion, far less did there exist any just grounds, for changing them from their true character in grammar.

THE TERM EPHEMERA.

This forms another example of the loose manner in which medical terminology has been hitherto arranged, being inserted in the Dictionary as a noun of the first declension, and made to signify “a fever of a day’s duration.”* It is no noun, but the nominative singular feminine of the adjective *Ephemerus*, *a, um*, which answers perfectly all that is wanted, without the least necessity for creating a new term and attaching to it a meaning which it can never bear. *Ephemera* carries no precise idea of fever of any kind, but signifies, of or belonging to a day, and in this sense or quality is applied in Pathology to a fever, the constitution of which is limited to one accession of twenty-four hours; while the same spelling, but which forms the nominative plural neuter, is applied in Entomology to the *genera* or *kinds* of insects that live but one day.

Let it be viewed in its true light as the nominative singular feminine of *Ephemerus*, with the word *febris*, f. a fever,

* Hooper.

understood; or as the nominative plural neuter, with *genera*; and difficulty and error are cleared away.

TERMS APPLIED AS DISTINCTIVE OF THE QUALITIES OF MEDICINES, *NARCOTICS*, *ANTISPASMODICS*, *TONICS*, ETC.

The characteristic titles given to groups of Medicines classified according to their medicinal powers or effects, are in an unsatisfactory condition; no distinct grammatical status being assigned to them. The only one characterised in any way is represented as a noun, "*Cholagogus*, *i. m.*; from $\chiολη$, bile, and $αγω$, to drive away."* Some are explained as "applied adjectively and substantively," (viz., Narcotic, Emetic, &c.); while another, Escharotic, is declared to be "a substance which" &c. Such imperfect and incongruous statements create confusion, but they all tend to imply, as proper to these distinctive titles of medicines, the general character of nouns. But such is by no means the case; they and every other of similar application are distinctly adjectives or participles, capable, like all such, of being used substantively, no doubt, in the nominative singular or plural, masculine, feminine, or neuter, in agreement with the same case of *haustus*, *potio*, *mistura*, *julapium*, or *medicamentum*, understood.

NAMES OF CHEMICAL PRINCIPLES, *FIBRINE*, *STEARINE*, *SALICINE*, ETC.

The names given to certain chemical principles discovered in animal and vegetable substances, are spelt in two different ways, according to the fancy, it would seem, of those who employ them; for example, Fibrin and Fibrine, Lignin and Lignine, &c. This, doubtless, presents but a very slight discrepancy, yet is it sufficiently palpable to render its removal

* Hooper.

desirable. It would be difficult to determine, by any special rule, which of the two modes is the most proper, but, at least, we ought not to have both. Let us, therefore, endeavour to decide as to the preferable one, on such grounds as may present themselves.

The final *e* is superfluous as to the sound of such words, for it is in no instance given effect to in pronouncing their last syllables. Thus, we do not say *Fibrine* or *Lignine*, giving the last syllable as in the English numeral adjective *nine*, but utter it according to the *true* Latin pronunciation of the letter *i*, viz., as if *Fibreen* and *Ligdeen*, &c., adopting, in fact, and justly, the Latin words themselves, short only of their characteristic termination.*

It is superfluous, also, as to conveying any sign of their status or meaning, which it might be supposed to constitute. But, again, by using the final *e* in the orthography of these names, a confusion is created in some examples of them, between the same word used as the name of a chemical principle, and also as an adjective; thus, *Crystalline* is a name given to one of the products of the distillation of Indigo; and *Crystalline* forms an adjective expressing, of or belonging to crystal, or having the appearance of crystals, &c. Such confusion will be avoided, however, by our entirely discarding the final *e* from the former, and from every such word, thus, *Crystallin*; and by letting it remain in the latter, and all of similar character. Besides, to my apprehension, the absence of the *e* presents, or seems to present, a more distinctive indication of their chemical relation.

It is suggested, then, that such names, with exception, it may be, of one or two, too strongly fixed by habit, perhaps, to be conveniently altered, as *Quinine*,—yet this is scarcely

* The Latin *i*, it may be necessary to remind some of my readers, on the Continent and wherever that language, pure or mixed, is spoken, receives the sound here expressed, and not that usually given to it in England;—for example, *virus* is pronounced as if *veerus*, not *vyrus*. It has been, and generally is, thus taught, in Scotland.

a sufficient reason for excepting even one,—should be spelt like Fibrin, and Lignin.

THE LATIN DIPHTHONG *Æ*, AND ITS TRANSLATION IN
ENGLISH TERMS.

We have no uniformity, no settled understanding, as to another discrepancy, which might as well and very simply, be brought under certain arrangement. It consists in the difference in the manner of rendering into English orthography those Greek-derived Latin terms in which the diphthong *æ* occurs.

This diphthong is by many adopted into the English, as in Hæmorrhage, Hæmaphæin, &c., while by as many, probably, it is changed into the letter *e*, as in Hemorrhage, Hemaphein, &c. The latter mode is to be preferred, on several grounds; it is more simple, more English, and there exists abundant precedent for holding it to be more correct. Spherical from *Sphæricus*, Demon from *Dæmon*, Equal from *Æqualis*, and numerous other analogous terms are derived in a precisely similar way, and may well serve to regulate our decision on this matter. I propose, therefore, that for uniformity and simplicity's sake, the diphthong *æ* of Latin terms should invariably be Anglicised by substitution of the letter *e*.

THE TERM *LAMBDOIDALIS*.

This term, which is usually applied to a suture or irregular line marked by the junction of the Parietal and Occipital bones of the cranium, presents an example of the erroneous substitution of a term of this form, for one ending in *-ides*, on which, possibly, it was thought to be an improvement. It is quite unauthorised by classical precedent, is clumsy and useless, the term *Lambdoides* being a much more suitable, and at the same

time, the legitimate one. There are many words of like form, some of which may be very properly used in their right places, whereas others are, as this is, improperly made to supplant their originals in *-ides*. In this respect, they stand in much the same condition as do the terms in *-ideus* formerly treated of, and to which they form a superfluous addition.* Indeed, it must be owned, that they are a set of ill-constructed compounds, as unfit as they were unnecessary, to take the place of those just noticed.

Lambdoidalis, if admitted at all to be correct in itself, can only be viewed as the derivative, not directly of λ or *lambda* and $\epsilon\lambda\delta\omicron\varsigma$, but of *Lambdoides*, and must be held to mean, not, resembling the letter λ , as the term it is derived from signifies, but, belonging to *Lambdoides (sutura)* the lambdoid suture, or any other object to which the prototypal word may be applied; lambdoidal. It is therefore incorrectly employed in connection with the suture of the cranium referred to. Of the similar words that are rightly employed, I may mention *Ethmoidalis (sutura)* and *Sphenoidalis (sutura)* and it will be as well to examine into the reasons, why terms, which are so closely similar in their terminal form, and so much alike in their application, are quite right in one case, and positively wrong in the other.

Lambdoides, lambdoid, or resembling λ , is aptly designative of the Occipito-parietal suture; for it denotes with sufficient accuracy the course or direction which it takes: but *Lambdoidalis* cannot, with any propriety, be applied to the same object, because it does not mean lambdoid, or shaped like λ , but, belonging to that which is so shaped. *Ethmoides*, or sieve-like, on the other hand, cannot well be applied to a suture formed by the Ethmoid with other bones, because, in this case, the suture has no such resemblance as this term in *-ides* implies; *Ethmoidalis*, however, is most appropriately used for characterising that object, because it expresses, belonging to or connected with the *Ethmoides os*, or sieve-like bone.

* See Div. I., Sect ii., page 26.

In the first example, the suture is lambdoid, or like the Greek letter λ ; and certain attachments of the pericranium to the irregular points or interstices of the suture, may be called lambdoidal, or connected with the lambdoid suture. In the second, the suture is *not* ethmoid, or sieve-like, but is ethmoidal, or connected with the ethmoid or sieve-like bone. The same may be said of *Sphenoidalis sutura*. What is wished to be particularly impressed on the reader's attention, is the manifest distinction to be observed between *Lambdoidalis* and *Lambdoides*, for which latter term, in its application to the Occipito-parietal suture, the former is incorrectly used; and also between all such contrasted terms, according to the circumstances of each.

THE ANATOMICAL TERM *ZYGOMA*.

This anatomical term has been represented to be “(From $\zetaυγος$, a yoke: because it transmits the tendon of the temporal muscle like a yoke.) The cavity under the Zygomatic process of the temporal bone and os malæ.”* What particular likeness the cavity alluded to may bear to a yoke, it is hard to discover or even to guess. Neither is the reason which has been presented for the derivation correct, nor has the part, to which the term is here applied, any pretension whatever to be so designated.

Zygoma is but another name for the *Os jugale*, *Os malæ*, or cheek-bone, and is so called from $\zetaυγος$, a yoke, because it is joined by the peculiar formation of its chief process, to the corresponding portion of the Temporal bone, the two uniting to form something like the yoke by which oxen were joined together in drawing the plough, &c. The cavity and processes of the *Os jugale*, and also of the *Os temporis*, are called Zygomatic, simply because belonging to, or connected with, the *Zygoma* or cheek-bone.

* Hooper.

CONCLUSION.

HAVING now exhibited the more prominent of the many defects, anomalies, errors, and discrepancies existing in Scientific Nomenclature, as well general as medical; and having ventured to put forth such suggestions for their correction as a persevering and minute examination of the subject has enabled me to offer, it seems unnecessary to trespass further on my reader's patience. Those of the motley crowd of imperfections which remain unnoticed here, are either so self-evident, or of such minor importance, that the observations already made may be easily extended to them, while their precise nature and any additional peculiarities which they may exhibit, will be carefully noted and explained in their proper places in the forthcoming Lexicon.

In publishing these somewhat revolutionary sentiments, first in the *Lancet* and now in this form, I have had but one object in view—to submit them to the test of abler minds for approval or condemnation. Whatsoever of blindness, misconception, or dogmatism may appear to be chargeable against me, my aim, I trust, will entitle me to some indulgence. The unhappy propensity in some persons to make new words on trifling occasion, and, often, out of very raw materials indeed; and a blundering aptitude in others for misusing those already in existence, have brought contempt on the terminology more especially of Medicine. An attempt to effect some degree of improvement was surely not uncalled for.

In conclusion, I beg leave to repeat, that, while I should be much gratified by corroboration of the opinions expressed, I shall feel no less grateful for being kindly favoured with the statement of distinct grounds of their refutation.